DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 727   CE 038 468

AUTHOR	Johnson, Miriam
TITLE	The State of the Art in Job Search Training.
INSTITUTION	Olympus Research Centers, Salt Lake City, Utah.
SPONS AGENCY	Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
PUB DATE	1 Feb 82
NOTE	148p.; For a related document, see CE 038 467.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Career Education; *Curriculum; Federal Programs; *Job Search Methods; Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; Secondary Education; State of the Art Reviews; *Teaching Methods; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes a national state of the art study of job search training (JST) programs, namely, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, the Work Incentive Program, and the employment service. Special emphasis is placed on youth programs. An introductory chapter defines JST, provides a brief history of JST development, and assesses the adequacy of research and development on this intervention. Chapter II briefly describes JST as it exists in each of the major employment and training settings. It then deals with critical administrative issues such as problems surrounding outcome and cost accounting in JST programs. The focus of chapter III is on how JST group sessions are conducted, the main actors (group leaders and participants), the methods used by leaders, and the general flavor of the experience. The two chapters that follow deal with the curriculum. They divide the content between pre-search preparation and orientation of the job seekers and the instructions and training provided for the actual job search. The final chapter synthesizes findings representing the most minimal needs, gaps, and unanswered questions found in this study. An appendix contains the methodology and a description of the selected sites. (YLB)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED241727

THE STATE OF THE ART IN
JOB SEARCH TRAINING

by
Miriam Johnson

Submitted to:

Office of Research and Development
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

February 1, 1982

This report was prepared for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research development grant no. 21-49-80-06. Since grantees conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgments freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The grantee is solely responsible for the contents of this paper.

Olympus Research Centers
1670 East Thirteenth South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84105
1453 Mission Street, Suite 312
San Francisco, California 94103

CE 030 467

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes a national state of the art study of Job Search Training programs (JST) as offered in Labor Department funded programs--CETA and WIN, and the employment service--with special emphasis on youth programs. The field research involved observations and interviews at 30 JST sites, selected for their unique modeling dimensions. Telephone interviews were conducted with and program materials were obtained from at least that many additional JST programs. All of these materials were examined and analyzed on multiple levels. The most significant findings were:

1. JSTs appear to be an important and valuable social intervention. They are capable of improving the job search skills and increasing the intensity of search efforts for all types of job seekers. There is strong evidence that JST programs meet with much public favor. In contrast to other employability development programs, JSTs are reasonably short, low-cost, and effective. The group format is particularly suited to public agencies whose resources are rapidly declining.

2. Though there are a rich array of JST models, a few have been widely emulated and dominate the field. Frequently, these models were developed for white collar and professional clientele and involve techniques which are not always appropriate or relevant to the target populations of the DOL funded programs. Reflecting previous funding levels, they drew on a fairly substantial resource base resulting in some cases in excessively drawn out programs which require full stipends. It is doubtful whether these models will survive in the current atmosphere. If JST is continued in the future, new models should be explored.

3. JST programs have suffered from persistent neglect and lack of oversight from national policy makers and administrators. Assuming that JSTs will be a legitimate service component in the future, and that some national guidance and leadership will be forthcoming, the ORC study identified minimum needs, gaps, and unanswered questions:

    a. Most of the JST programs had a relatively meager body of knowledge about their basic subject matter--how people can best conduct a productive search for work. The content, the substance of the programs need to be improved. A few relatively simple steps could be taken nationally to help alleviate this problem.

    b. The administration of JST programs has been hampered by duplication of effort, underutilization, absence of criteria for staff selection and training, and inadequate national standards for measuring costs and outcomes. Several administrative actions would be useful to alleviate these administrative problems.

c. JST programs would benefit from two types of research effort: (1) More evaluations are needed of JST cost effectiveness, some comparing JST to other or no interventions, and additional ones comparing the results of different JST models; (2) labor market research is sorely needed to examine hiring processes in different hiring environments. Now, the JST field is permeated with mythology, and over-dominated by a singular image of the white collar professional job-finding process. Very little research has been conducted about these processes in blue collar and service occupations, areas where most participants find work.

d. Government sponsored JST programs suffer from inadequate dissemination of information to job seekers and employers about the existence and value of JST. A national clearinghouse to disseminate JST materials could be of major assistance to program operators.

If JST is here to stay, it needs more attention than it has been getting from policy makers. A supporting infrastructure of policies and administrative actions is needed to support, underpin, and refine the JST programs. An investment in building this infrastructure would appear worthwhile because there are skills and knowledge about finding work which can be imparted successfully, to everyone's benefit.

4

STATE OF THE ART

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Chapter I. Background and Setting 1
Definition of JST 2
Undercurrents Leading to JST 4
History of JST and Recent Developments 6
Dangers to JST 12
Structure of the Report 14

Chapter II. Administrative Issues 15
JST in the Work Incentive Program 15
CETA and JST 17
JST in the Employment Service 19
Implementation of "Obtained Employment" 21
Outcomes Issues 24
Cost Issues 28
Summary 33

Chapter III. Teaching Environment and Methods 35
The Physical Environment 36
Overview--Description of JST Methods 39
The Participants 48
Selecting Group Leaders 50
Conclusions 56

Chapter IV. Preparation for the Search 60
Criteria for Evaluation 62
Data Base 64
Pre-Search Knowledge and Decisions 65

Table of Contents, Cont.

Chapter V. Content Analysis: The Search for a Job 87
  Finding the Job Openings 87
  Presenting Oneself to the Employer--The Written Word 94
  Presenting Oneself to the Employer--The Spoken Word 101
  Follow-Up 114
  Conclusion 115

Chapter VI. Summary of Findings 116

Appendix

Bibliography

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In January 1980, the Office of Research and Development in the Employment and Training Administration contracted with Olympus Research Centers (ORC) to conduct a national study of Job Search Training (JST) programs offered in the local offices of the State Employment Services, in the Work Incentive Programs (WIN), and in programs sponsored under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). A state of the art study was conducted which included field visits to 30 JST programs, the examination and analysis of numerous documents, and interviews with significant individuals in the field.

This volume is one of three which constitute the final report submitted by Olympus Research Centers to the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Research and Development, under Grant No. 21-49-80-06. The other two volumes include Job Search: A Review of the Literature, and JOB TRACK: Evaluation of a Youth Job Search Demonstration.

Numerous individuals and institutions shared their wisdom, experience, and knowledge with ORC staff in the course of the study. Personnel at visited sites, national and state officials with knowledge of WIN, ES, and CETA, officials of the Office of Youth Programs, and many other operators and innovators in the field extended every courtesy to the staff. On many occasions, they performed extra duties to provide ORC with data, made special trips for personal interviews, mailed materials, and offered valuable insights to the analysis.

It is, however, the ORC staff and consultants who, with extraordinary devotion, hard work, and sheer brain power, gave form to and managed to make sense from what often appeared to be an inchoate body of information. Kristin Nelson, Jeanette Velasco, and Donna Kolb organized and managed the clerical work, which involved the storing and retrieving of vast amounts of program materials; Amy Silver developed the matrices for capturing participant data; Katherine Silver reviewed and analyzed the program literature and handouts; Donald Mayall added his knowledge of labor markets and career guidance; Laurie Olsen's teaching experience and knowledge of youth employment problems contributed to the site observations and the analysis of the data; Dr. Joyce Morton's training and knowledge of sociology and psychology informed the field observations and influenced the approach to

the analysis; David Roberts, in addition to field visiting, contributed significantly to the analytical framework and the research design.

ORC was fortunate in having Dr. Robert Wegmann as a consultant throughout the life of the project. His extensive knowledge of job search training programs and his uncommon skill in synthesis were a significant contribution to the perceptions of the staff, and the analysis of sites he observed. Dr. Garth Mangum offered his invaluable knowledge and insights about the delivery systems and the particular vantage point of the economist and writer to this study. Al Richmond's experience and knowledge as writer and editor helped make the final report cohesive and readable.

ORC is particularly grateful to Bonnie Coe, Project Officer in the Office of Research and Development, Department of Labor, for the advice she offered, the encouragement, and the exposure to materials which ORC would otherwise have had difficulty in locating. The cooperation offered by her and by that office was uncommonly sensitive and helpful.

Miriam Johnson
Project Director

Chapter I

BACKGROUND AND SETTING

Early in 1978, Olympus Research Centers proposed to the Office of Research and Development that a study of job search training (JST) programs be undertaken. Some of the ORC principals had long been interested in JST efforts. They had noted a growing national awareness that job search skills were a factor in the employment picture. Experimentation with JST as a service component was also on the increase. For a variety of reasons, the proposed study was delayed. Two years later, this study of job search training programs was undertaken. During the two-year hiatus, the interest had grown markedly. JST programs had proliferated at such a fast rate as to complicate the research task, and, at the same time, increase the potential value of the study.

This is the final report of the research project, following nearly two years of total immersion by ORC staff. It is best characterized as a report of the "state of the art" in JST. It describes the evolving field in an orderly and analytical fashion, examines the diversity which flavors the relatively early stages of this complex component, and raises theoretical and administrative issues which, if resolved, would increase the potential value of this relatively new tool in the kit of employability interventions.

It is important that the reader understand clearly what this report is not designed to accomplish. It is not an evaluation. It does not grade or rate different program models or offer the ideal model. It does not separate and delineate which factors contribute more or less to successful outcomes, assuming that such a complex task is actually possible. It is not a field manual or a technical assistance guide. It does not provide precise guidelines to program operators about how to establish, operate, or improve a JST program, though the issues raised may provide a more thoughtful basis for program decisions. In ORC's view, "what's out there?" must first be described as it is in this report before the evaluative questions "does it work, what makes it work, and what works best?" can be knowledgeably addressed.

It is also important for the reader to be aware that all of the research and much of the analysis was rooted in the institutional realities of 1979/1980 at which time it was assumed that the Department of Labor delivery systems--CETA, WIN, the state employment services, youth programs--were relatively stable. It was also assumed that changes in budgetary allocations would not significantly affect the variety of options open to program operators who might administer a JST program in any one of the delivery systems.

This report is submitted at a point when the delivery systems are undergoing massive changes, leading to possible elimination of some of the programs and institutions. The shape of what will eventually emerge, the level of resources that will be available, and the populations toward which programs will be targeted are unknown. Yet the report continues to have relevance based upon the following assumptions:

1. By whatever title, and in whatever form, one or more institutions will be charged with delivering some type of employment and/or employability services to people looking for work.

2. There will be fewer resources and fewer options available to program operators than there were when field observations were conducted. Hence, the cost elements of various models will assume greater importance.

3. A major task of the service delivering institutions will be to facilitate the movement of people into unsubsidized employment.

4. One relatively effective and low cost method for fulfilling that task is almost certain to be JST: teaching people, in group format, to become more effective in conducting their own search for work.

This introductory chapter defines Job Search Training as used in this study. It then provides a brief history of JST development against recent American social trends and undercurrents. The chapter continues with a thumbnail description of the most pervasive JST models found in the field and then assesses the adequacy of research and development into this intervention. It concludes with an introduction to the remaining chapters in the report.

Definition of JST

The term "job search training" has many different meanings to field operators. Imparting information about how to look for work appears in many forms, in many types of activities and programs. However, research requires specificity about what it is that is to be studied. The perimeters of the playing field needed to be clearly fenced lest all manner of peripherally related activities flow in and obscure the phenomena under study. For purposes of this study, JST was defined as follows:

- A discrete, identifiable continuing component operating within employment and/or training programs. This was intended to keep out those episodic, single events whereby job search information is provided in lecture or other forms. Such activities are too difficult to capture for study purposes and their effect is too limited to be worth studying.

- The activity prepares, informs, teaches, and/or gives practical experience to job seekers to carry out direct contact with employers in pursuit of a job for themselves.

- The program format requires that participants are directly and personally involved in a group activity. This elminates any form of one-to-one advice giving and counseling about looking for work. It also excludes activities that are limited to the preparation and dissemination of job search materials.

- Participants are job seekers who are currently or imminently involved in a search for work. This eliminates in-school, in-training, or assessment programs that offer JST as a part of other curriculums or as a secondary activity which participants would not put into immediate practice.

- The organizations providing assistance are Department of Labor-funded agencies active in local labor markets. This was intended to mark off the widespread development outside of DOL delivery systems. College programs, women's groups, the private sector, educational TV, a whole host of activities devoted to both career choice and job search had been emerging which, if examined, would have diluted the central focus of this study.

A job search training program could include any one or all of the following basic components: (1) Providing information about the search for work and the labor market, (2) providing training and practice in acquiring job search skills, (3) providing supervision during the actual job search, and (4) providing positive reinforcement and group support.

Undercurrents Leading to JST

The widespread proliferation of JST nationally appears to be a somewhat inexorable expression of a number of undercurrents and trends in the United States during the decades of the sixties and seventies. These pressures have affected the delivery of most human services, and employability services in particular:

1. For many years public institutions charged with the delivery of employability services have been grappling with a triple onus: decreasing resources, increasing demands for services and, inevitably, discouraging and uninspiring success rates.

   For examples, in real terms, the resources of the public employment service* had been shrinking in the past ten years. Yet the flow of job seekers continued unabated and, in fact, was enlarged by new groups of displaced workers from numerous plant closings, by an influx of needy refugees, and by a flow of women returning to the work force. The ability of the employment service to deliver a one-to-one, job development and brokering service to a significant portion of its job seeker clients, which was strained and somewhat mythical even in the best of times, was becoming more and more questionable. As of December 1981 the public employment service is faced with budget cuts of such magnitude that its very existence is in jeopardy.

   The WIN program had never been able to provide full one-to-one services to all potentially eligible clients, and even less so as WIN budgets failed to keep up with inflation. Even more compelling, increasing national sensitivity to the welfare "burden" created a special onus on the WIN program to demonstrate effective methods for moving people off of welfare and into gainful private employment. The reported success rates of JST prorgrams seemed to provide answers to both limited resources and moving people off of welfare.

   In CETA the reduction and subsequent dismantling of public service employment obligated prime sponsors to develop some type of transition services to aid in placing terminees into unsubsidized employment. JST was a reasonable response to that obligation.

   In sum, delivery systems in the employment and employability arena have been in real difficulty for some time. The traditional modes for providing services were not fulfilling expectations. There had to be ways to extend the limited resources to more people and show better success rates for the effort.

---

*The state employment service agencies are called different things in different states. The term "Job Service" is in common use. However, this report will use "employment service" and "ES" as the more readily identified name and initials.

2. Over the past decade, research into job search and recruitment patterns intensified and threw greater light on the processes by which job openings occur and are filled. The behavior of the labor market was becoming less obscure as increasing flows of hard data came from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from the Employment Service Potential Project, and from other studies. The data proved what had only been a hypothesis of labor economists--that most people find jobs and most employers seek workers through very informal but effective means. Better turnover data became available, indicating that there is far more movement of workers in and out of jobs than had been suspected heretofore. Presumably, each movement opens a job, which gives rise to the assumption that there are always jobs "out there" somewhere if people just know how to pursue them. If, the logic goes, most people do indeed get jobs through their own efforts, and there are always jobs out there, why can't clients of publicly funded institutions be taught to get them?

3. The late 60s and 70s saw a marked growth in the United States in the movement of people towards self-help groupings designed to solve or confront a whole host of personal and social problems. There are many explanations for this development including the popular feelings that professional service deliverers are either unwilling or unable to meet growing needs and expectations, or meet them inadequately and at prohibitive costs. Among other benefits derived from self-help groups, the therapeutic potency of sharing common problems and supporting one another's efforts to solve them has been widely proclaimed. National disenchantment with authority figures and institutions has also resulted in a demystification of the professionals' role. To fill the gap, people were impelled to acquire some of the skills and knowledge that had heretofore resided solely in the professionally trained, licensed, or credentialed service deliverer. In the employment and training world the self-help consciousness was translated into a delivery mode whereby the agency itself undertakes to impart its technical skills and the knowledge of its professional labor market brokers to client job seekers. It is done in group format, for the value of the shared experience, but the major responsibility for getting a job is shifted to the client.

4. An important impetus towards proliferation of JST programs has come from outside of the service delivery system--from the response of entrepreneurs in the private sector to a perceived need. All manner of personnel consultants, career-guidance, and educational firms as well as a whole array of authors are discovering a lucrative field by providing an avalanche of "how-to-do-it" packages, articles, literature, newspaper columns, TV programs, and books designed to educate the individual about how to select careers and find jobs. Across the country numbers of private for profit and not for profit firms and organizations have emerged that solicit CETA primes and other service delivery organizations for contracts to provide packaged JST programs for their clients. Newstands and bookshelves are showing an ever growing list of book titles devoted to inspiring readers with better management of their working lives. What Color Is Your Parachute? by Richard Bolles has been an on and off best seller ever since it was first published.

Hotel meeting rooms are filled with workshops about career choice and job search, and colleges offer regular courses as well as costly weekend seminars devoted to confronting the labor market.

There is a ready audience for books and seminars among the swelling number of youth attending college but unsure of what to do beyond, the flood of former housewives seeking a meaningful role in the labor market, the displaced and disgruntled middle-aged executives and professionals seeking to reorient their careers, and the growing number of early retirees wanting a second career but uncertain how to apply their skills. That audience is very different, however, from most participants in employment and training programs whose interests are usually more immediate and compelling. The interests of the former are mainly focused on career choice, with job search as a secondary component; the latter seek immediate employment. Nevertheless, it is perhaps inevitable that the literature and practices of career-choice enthusiasts would be grasped by the eager curriculum developers of the new JST programs offered within the employment and training systems.

History of JST and Recent Developments

Anyone who has ever worked at the delivery point of an employment agency is sharply aware of how often the behavior of a client during the job search process proves to be a more potent element, for good or evil, than more objective qualifications based on experience and job skills. Front line professionals have repeatedly seen a better qualified referral lose out to a competitor with a more relaxed manner or attractive appearance but less experience and fewer job skills. Harried placement interviewers in the employment service have often attempted to provide personal advice to a referral about what to say to an employer or what to wear to an interview. Unlike other brokering activities, such as in real estate, the job seeker himself usually plays an active role in determining the final outcome of a labor market transaction.

Despite that front line knowledge, the public employment service nationally has heretofore stayed out of the arena of "educating" job seekers except to authorize the development and distribution of written "how-to-do-it" brochures for client use in the local offices. ES has always perceived its primary function as a labor market intermediary whose main concern was to provide a one-to-one placement service. The system by which resources were allocated to states has reflected this policy emphasis. Credit for placement was counted only when the agency matched a person to a job. The activity of assisting people to find jobs on their own was not legitimized and jobs obtained through such activity have never been credited as placement. With neither credit nor funding, state agencies have been disinclined to move in the direction of JST.

Yet through the years despite such institutional disincentives, JST programs have emerged and persisted, both within the ES and in the employability programs even before the advent of CETA. During the 60s, under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA), a number of JST programs emerged with varying degrees of effectiveness. In Oregon, for example, between 1965 and 1967, a massive JST program was instituted which reached 33,000 individuals in both day and night activities. In Washington state, during the heavy aerospace layoffs in 1971, a JST program was undertaken, which is still operating for a wider population, under legislation enacted by the Washington State Legislature. Between 1972 and 1978 the Washington program served over 27,000 participants. The history of the 60s and 70s is replete with efforts of innovative and dedicated individuals who developed and experimented with ways to teach people how to remove the additional barriers created when the job-getting game is poorly played.

Despite the gut sense of its value, and despite its many enthusiastic adherents over the years, none of the JST efforts were submitted to the hard test of rigorous experimentation and evaluation until the mid-70s. Though national ES leadership has until now made no formal acknowledgement of the field efforts, and provided neither research nor demonstration funding, these earlier attempts have had a persistent lateral effect on the delivery systems. Periodically and sporadically, various local offices or programs across the country undertake a JST program. Perhaps the most important impact is seen in the California ES, the Employment Development Department (EDD). It approved and institutionalized the delivery of a JST service to the flow-of-traffic in its local offices in the late 60s. The effort floundered until 1975 when JST became a reportable priority item in most of the local offices. The program is still actively pursued, despite the absence of placement credit or special funding support.*

In the past six years new impetus towards JST proliferation has come from the emergence of three JST models which have received considerable national recognition and have been widely replicated. Together with the ES/EDD model, these four constitute the most frequently encountered JST models in the field and exert strong influences upon the content of nearly all programs. They are here reviewed briefly.

---

*EDD required local offices to report on the service offered and number of participants but no outcome data was obtained. The activity was incorporated under regular ES grant funding.

ES Model

Whether in California or in other states, ES local offices delivering a JST program all confront a common reality which determines the most important characteristic of an ES model and distinguishes it from JST programs in CETA or WIN. The participants, whether referred to JST from the local office traffic flow or through word of mouth, are there voluntarily, with neither "carrot" nor "stick" to attract or retain them.* As a consequence, ORC did not encounter any ES program cycles that exceeded a total of fifteen hours, usually offered within one week, and many programs consisted of less than eight hours a week.

Because of the short cycle, none of the ES programs observed by ORC included any element of supervised search or provided participants with the "learning by doing" practice in interviewing or telephoning that characterize longer, stipended programs. The JSTs consist mainly of providing information by lecture and discussion in group format. Because ES is a labor market institution, the information is generally quite rich but little effort is devoted to morale building or group dynamics. Beyond those cited common characteristics, ES programs vary widely in curriculum emphasis, in participant targeting, in organization of time, and in personal delivery style.

Job Clubs

Early in the seventies, Dr. Nathan Azrin, a behavioral psychologist in Carbondale, Illinois, first began to apply concepts and techniques from his own field to the development of a JST model which he called Job Clubs. He tested the model and compared outcomes to unserved control groups. Results indicated that the Job Club members found work far sooner than did the control groups. The Department of Labor then provided Dr. Azrin with funds to conduct an experiment with WIN clients in five cities which compared outcomes for Job Club members with results obtained when clients went through the regular one-to-one services offered by WIN. It was found that 64 percent of those in Job Clubs obtained work compared to only 33 percent in the comparison group.

---

*In a few cases, unemployment insurance claimants are required to attend a short session which is combined with the Eligibility Benefit Rights Interview (EBRI) at the beginning of a claim.

Dr. Azrin submitted a report of the WIN experiment in 1978. Though the findings were viewed with some caution, these were the first hard data which suggested the value of JST, and it had reverberating effects in the employment and training community. The leaders of the WIN program were so impressed that they adopted group job seeking training as a national program. Other institutions besides WIN have been trained in Job Club methods.

The Job Clubs' approach retains the strong influence of behavioral psychology and depends heavily on a tight and rigid curriculum delivered in a directive style, weighted heavily towards producing behavioral change, with little emphasis on providing knowledge and labor market information. The course consists of 25-30 hours of classroom work, sometimes offered full-time for one week or half-time for two weeks, the rest of the time being devoted to supervised search activities. The length of a cycle is vague--from six weeks to three months. Participants are AFDC welfare clients who receive incentive payments while in Job Club in addition to their welfare benefits. Though there are voluntary participants, better than half are mandated to make the effort.

One of the questions that remains unanswered by the Azrin WIN experiment is whether the impressive results reported are properly attributable to the particular model spawned by behavioral psychololgy. There has not yet been a study which compares that model to alternative JST group approaches. One may conjecture that the most critical element leading to such impressive success rates as reported by Dr. Azrin might well have been the mere grouping of individuals while supervising and supporting their search for work.

Self-Directed Placement

In the early 70s Charles Hoffman, a businessman in San Diego, became concerned about the high fees paid to private employment agencies by applicants placed in jobs. He went to work as a counselor for a private agency for a few months and became familiar with their methods. Stuck by the possibility of "eliminating the middle man," he established a private corporation to teach individual clients how to use the private agency methods to find their own jobs. Hoffman then signed a contract with the San Diego prime sponsor to provide JST to CETA clients. The individual service was changed to a group format. The first effort produced an 80 percent placement rate, and the Hoffman contract has since been repeatedly renewed. Hoffman also contracted with the California State WIN program to train staff of five WIN units in the "self-directed placement" approach.

The "Bill Moyers Journal" filmed the program in action and presented it on a one-hour show on national public television. The Moyers' tape has since circulated widely in employment and training circles throughout the country. Its influence on JST consciousness and on the content of programs has been extensive. At one point, the Self-Directed Placement Corporation had contracts to deliver JST programs in 19 different locations. Reported placement rates vary markedly from program to program, ranging from less than 50 percent to as high as 92 percent. The Hoffman model has not been subject to formal evaluation, nor has there been any comparison made to other models. As a private, profit-making firm, the company exercises proprietory rights over its materials and curriculums. ORC was permitted only one day of observation, but did visit other programs that have drawn heavily from the "self-directed placement" model, including one of the Hoffman-trained WIN sites.

The Hoffman model reflects its private employment agency inspiration and point of origin. It depends heavily on a high energy delivery style, on the exclusive use of the telephone to unearth job openings, and it emphasizes the importance of learning typical sales techniques when approaching the employer. The course is four weeks long, full-time, with one week devoted to classroom training, and the rest to supervised search. CETA eligible participants receive full CETA stipends.

Job Factory

This model originated in Cambridge, Massachusetts. It represents a joint effort of the director of the CETA prime sponsor, Joe Fisher, and a consultant, Burt Cullen. Cullen had been a personnel director for a manufacturing firm and a private consultant to both industry and the prime sponsor. The initial effort was targeted to CETA-eligible clients who had been unemployed for six months or longer. This was later modified to include all CETA eligible clients.

The most significant features of the model are reflective of Cullen's manufacturing orientation and his personnel work. The program initially set out to simulate the blue-collar work setting, with time clocks, a "foreman" accountability for production, and a full eight hour "work" day devoted to classroom training or supervised search, with pay docked for tardiness and absenteeism. The rationale for this approach was the perceived need for resocialization of the long-term unemployed. Cullen believed that such individuals lose the habit of thinking of themselves as working people and abandon all of the daily routines associated with working. Job Factory was represented as a "job," demanding the behavior of an employed person.

The program has been in operation for over five years and staff has provided training to other CETA primes interested in replicating the Job Factory model. Program administrators claim an overall 66 percent success rate. Job Factory has not been subject to an evaluative comparison with other interventions or other JST models. However, a nationally funded Youth Demonstration Project was conducted in the Job Factory installation called Job Factory for Youth (JFFY) which was carefully evaluated (Hahn, Andrew and Barry Friedman, 1981). Though retaining most elements of the adult model, a few accommodations were made for the youth population.

The program at Job Factory was one of the sites visited for the ORC data base. Like the self-directed placement model, Job Factory and JFFY operate a four-week program. More than a week is devoted to classroom "work," and the remaining time to supervised direct search. Both youth and adult clients are provided with full CETA stipends.

Comparisons

The three non-ES models all emerged within two years of one another. Though generated by different images and beliefs, they have always shared certain common characteristics. All three models depend on a "carrot" or "stick" to motivate participants to engage in a full-time, concentrated, sometimes demanding, period of search. All three provide some level of information about finding job opportunities, all train in interviewing skills, and all supervise the actual search process. They differ in what they teach, what they emphasize, and how they conduct the groups. Over time, however, these differences have become less sharply defined as program operators borrow liberally from all sources, and then put their own particular stamp on a program. Even those sites from which models originated have undergone some adaptations as they developed a base of experience.

All three are organically distinguished from ES programs by virtue of client support and inducement, which, in turn, affects the length of program and, inevitably, curriculum. Though a few of the more adventuresome ES programs have sought to infuse their presentation with materials garnered from the three models cited as well as from the popular literature, none of the important modeling elements that characterize these extended programs appear to be transferable to an ES setting. It is difficult to conceive how a local office could successfully motivate the flow-of-traffic job seekers to engage in a prolonged, full-time effort without providing some form of inducement.

Dangers to JST

The history of employment and training programs is replete with cycles of panaceas, fads, and overexpectations followed by disillusionment and abandonment of efforts. Programs which have worked well under one set of circumstances were often arbitrarily replicated in entirely different settings--and died there. The charisma and personal vision of inspired innovators created programs which drew attention to what appeared as exciting and promising, but when institutionalized, paled and floundered. The tenuousness of success standards, the sensitive interactions of people and circumstances, the length of time required to create enduring institutions and debugged programs, are all factors which are still too little recognized by those who make policy, administer or study publicly funded programs. Such cycles pose a dangerous set of traps for the future of JST programs which can, perhaps, be circumvented by looking at JSTs critically--not for the purpose of debunking but rather to enhance the process of learning and improving. The JST movement needs to be given thoughtful attention and serious and consistent commitment.

Most program operators make impressive claims for JST outcomes and their low costs. To date, the research and controlled experimentation has been extremely meager. The findings suggest that JSTs may be more effective than other types of interventions, but the issue is far from resolved and has yet to be explored in all of its dimensions. Despite the growth, size, and the diversity of JST offerings over the years, only four evaluative studies of individual job search training programs have been funded by the Employment and Training Administration. Of the four, two (Hann and Friedman, 1981 and Roberts, 1981) deal with youth programs and the other two (Azrin, et al., 1978 and Jordan-Laurenti, 1981) compare the outcomes of WIN Job Clubs to regular WIN services. The nearly fanatical commitment of operators working with JST programs coupled with the persistence of its appearance and reappearance in the field over the years, despite institutional and policy neglect, hints at a kind of activity that has a powerful, observable, positive impact on participants, the consequences of which may elude the cold demands of evaluative research designs. The rigors of quantifiable outcome measurements do not always capture the most critical verities and values of a human service. Further, it is questionable whether it would be possible to identify, dissect, and disaggregate various subtle elements that are different among programs, or even within the same program, with the degree of precision necessary to hold an isolated factor responsible for differences in outcomes. Even so, efforts need to be made to evaluate the differences between models on such gross, cost related factors as a one-week cycle as compared to a four-week cycle, or a stipended program compared to one paying only expenses to participate. The JST movement needs better guidelines on important dimensions which can best emerge from controlled experiments and evaluative comparisons.

From the onset, ORC was made sharply aware that field operators were encountering much difficulty in tracking down programs and materials, obtaining technical assistance, and meeting training needs. During the two years that ORC was involved in this study, it was beseiged with requests from program operators for materials, assistance, and advice. Since ORC's mandate and resources did not permit the operation of a clearning house, it was, regretfully, unable to fulfill the requests. But the need for a clearing house and technical assistance was clearly demonstrated.

Structure of the Report

In conceptualizing this final product of research, ORC thought of the potential audience as (a) policy makers who need to know how programs operate and need to decide whether or not the activity should or should not be supported and proliferated; (b) administrators who need to decide whether to undertake a JST program in their operations, and (c) JST program operators who need to compare what they do and why they do it with what others are doing. Hopefully, the issues that are surfaced in this report by knowledgeable observers who worked within a careful analytical framework will help fill those needs.

The report is structured to concentrate the reader on the kernel of the ORC research effort--the JST activity itself. It has been largely reshaped from the original draft to be more reflective of the current upheaval in employment and training programs. Chapter II deals with critical administrative issues such as problems surrounding outcome and cost accounting in JST programs, most particularly those associated with the changed ES policy towards "obtained employment." Chapter III focuses on how the group sessions are conducted and on the main actors--group leaders and participants. The substance of what is, in fact, taught about looking for work, is the preoccupation of Chapters IV and V, the former dealing with the pre-search preparation and orientation of the job seekers and the latter centering on the instructions and training provided for the actual job search. The final chapter summarizes the conclusions, identifies the implications, and explores alternatives. The methodology and a description of the selected sites is found in the appendix. Since ORC chose to concentrate its limited time and resources on the kernel--the JST programs themselves--the chapters are uneven in size and detail, but designed to be of maximum assistance to the policy maker and the program operator.

Chapter II

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

The single most important influence on JST programs that distinguished the major models was the institution in which they were embedded. The employment service, CETA, and WIN each had its own funding and cost accounting systems, its own goals, its own client characteristics, its institutional incentives and disincentives to operate JST programs, and its own administrative structure which, in a large measure, shaped models that were uniquely suited to that system. However, as this final report is being prepared, all of the conditions under which JST programs have been operating are in the process of enormous upheaval and change. At the end of 1981, it is not yet possible to discern the shape that future legislation and delivery systems will take, or what level of budgeting will finally prevail, except that sources will be severely reduced. Hence, the first draft of this report, which examined JST and reached conclusions about it in the context of these three institutional settings, may have lost much of its relevance. The institutional comparison of Table 1 may be largely of historical interest. This chapter briefly describes JST as it exists in each of the major employment and training settings and highlights the major issues which have emerged therein. Subsequent chapters then focus on substantive issues which will persist to the extent JST is made available to a competitively disadvantaged population, regardless of the institutional setting.

JST in the Work Incentive Program

In 1979 the national WIN office officially endorsed JST as a valid, credit-producing intervention for its AFDC welfare clients, and has since aggressively pressed for the implementation of that policy. It supported the program with demonstration funding, and provided training and technical assistance to state programs. By summer of 1981 over 100 local JST programs (called Job Clubs) in 40 states were established. WIN was the first national delivery system to institutionalize JST and in doing so, performed a major groundbreaking service to the field.

At the beginning of 1982, WIN is facing a cut in budget amounting to approximately one-third of its former funding. Its continuance into fiscal

TABLE 1 BROAD STROKED JST INSTITUTIONAL MODELS

	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	WIN	CETA
Usual Title	Job Search Workshops	Job Club	Self-Directed Placement, Job Club Job Factory, many others
TIME	Range-- 4 hours every two weeks to 15 hours one week, every week	Average classroom time-- 25 to 30 hours. Sometimes half day split with supervised search, sometimes full week followed by search.	3 to 4 week cycle. One week classroom.
PARTICIPANTS	Both heterogenous and homogenous targeted populations	AFDC clients, mainly female. Half "voluntary" and half "mandatory" clients. Able to work.	Generally mixed groups. PSE and youth are homogenous. Economically disadvantaged.
PARTICIPANT SOURCES	Traffic flow from local office or centralized for all local offices. UI claimants. Word of mouth.	New WIN registrants invited or referred by intake or placement.	All titles. Referred before and after assessment following training, free standing intervention. Advertising word of mouth, counselors.
DELIVERY STYLE	Classroom. Straight lecture. Many reading handouts.	Very little lecture. Exercises, morale building, films.	Delivery by private entrepreneurs or CETA central staff. High energy, much sales "hype."
CONTENT	Stronglabor market orientation. JST material, equipment, aids available. Emphasis on work application. No skill training in interviewing, telephoning.	Heavy on motivation. Little emphasis on occupational choice, or labor market information. Skill training in interviewing and telephone use. Letters to home. Thank you letters following interviews. Strong self-help emphasis.	Wide range. Weak in knowledge of labor market. Skill training in interviewing, telephone, application card, resumes.
LEADERS	ES staff. Often temporary intermittent. No formal selection process. Experiences placement interviewers seldom used. Leaders usually have other duties. Frequent changes. Occasional Es regional training.	"Anyone can do it." WIN staff, seldom with front lines ES experience or knowledge. No formal selection process. Occasional training seminars offered.	Staff selected and trained by sub contractor or CETA prime, Generally high powered. Occasionally ES staff for this purpose.
SUPERVISED SEARCH	None	3 to 6 weeks. Telephone from yellow pages. ads; etc. Emphasis calling friends and relatives.	Telephone "boiler room"; Informational interviews; Field supervision.
CARROT/STICK	None; UI claimants occasionally	National incentive $30/month; $3 to $5 per day expenses. (States vary) Threat of sanctions for non-participation though seldom invoked.	CETA stipend. May be "fired" for non attendance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1983 is problematical. In addition, the essential WIN structure may be undergoing basic institutional changes as 26 states have exercised their option and elected to operate a Work Incentive Demonstration Program for the purpose of demonstrating a single agency administration of WIN. This would effectively return the administration of WIN to the social welfare agencies and dismantle the present WIN delivery system.

However, by whatever title and under whatever aegis, welfare clients who are able to work will surely be required to participate in a funded program designed to move them off welfare and into gainful private employment. It is likely that some form of JST for AFDC recipients will be continued, both because of its relative success and its comparative cost effectiveness. A study conducted by an independent evaluator under contract with the state of Texas compared the Azrin model Job Clubs to regular WIN placement services (Jordan-Laurenti and Associates, 1981). Though the margin of difference between the two types of intervention was considerably smaller than was found by Dr. Azrin's earlier evaluations, the Texas study concluded that Job Clubs hold a greater promise for moving AFDC welfare clients into employment at less cost. However, the Texas study also surfaced a number of institutional problems surrounding the JST program and recommended some changes in the model.

CETA and JST

In the course of its study, ORC found a wide range of differences in the JST programs offered under the CETA system by the many prime sponsors and their subcontractors. With all of the current conjecture concerning CETA's future, the most important CETA characteristics which influenced the JST programs appear subject to drastic changes:

1. The decentralized CETA system created a number of JST programs, all discrete, with very different characteristics, without centralized direction, technical assistance, or oversight. In some cases, a single prime sponsor had several subcontactors, each providing JST services to a specific target group. One conjecture is that the CETA delivery system will be replaced by a smaller administrative network incorporating larger geographic areas. A possible effect of this on JST programs, if they are adopted as a service component of the new system, might be the creation of a centralized JST offering for a labor market area, serving many different targets. Considerable cost savings could be realized, with improvement in program quality.

2. JST participants in CETA programs have typically received full stipends for up to five weeks while they attended classes and searched for work. At the minimum wage level, this stipend constitutes a "job," the task being to find work. In any new employment and training program, it seems unlikely that people will be 'hired' to find work. Indeed, the greatest problem confronting the next generation of employment and training programs which opt for a JST component will likely be to develop new, shorter models which can operate without a full stipend. Job search expense money, or some other type of participant payment that offered some minimum assistance and had some holding power but did not equal a job in pay level, might be a model with which to experiment.

3. Paying full CETA stipends to youth in JST programs is even more unlikely in the future. A youth program that pays tax-free stipend equal to the federal minimum wage for up to four weeks is, in many cases, offering more than the youth could get on a job. The volatile nature of youth employment, the usually short duration of jobs obtained, and the frequent shifts between school and work force status raise serious doubts about the wisdom of paying full stipends to youth. At the very least, there is a need for measures to offset the confounding of motivation that stipends create. One two-week youth JST program with very high success rates used such a countervailing measure. The youth were warned that they would be ineligible for any other type of paid program following JST, thereby increasing the pressure for a serious approach to the JST program demands.

4. One consequence of the decentralized CETA system, with nearly 500 different prime sponsors, has been the proliferation and extensive use of commercial subcontractors delivering packaged JST programs. It is to the benefit of the service deliverer that a single JST cycle be long enough to warrant the contract. As a result, CETA JST programs have a relatively long cycle, conducted at a leisurely pace. Under more exacting conditions, JST programs could be tightened and shortened.

5. The question of JST timing in relation to other CETA offerings has been a concern of prime sponsors. In many locations, the JST program was "up front"--enrollees went from intake and assessment directly into JST, either as a discrete service or as a prerequisite for other CETA services, if the person was unsuccessful. Thus, JST was essentially a screening device. Those who could find a job with JST assistance were encouraged to do so, with further employability development reserved for those who could not. With vastly reduced resources, it seems certain that the future employment and training delivery system, whatever its specific structure, will be able to extend services to many more individuals if JST is used as an "up front" service. It may, indeed, be the only component available to most individuals.

JST in the Employment Service

New developments in the employment service have changed the playing field since the ORC state of the art field work and analysis were conducted:

1. An initial round of budget cutting in mid-1981 resulted in extensive cuts of ES staff across the nation and the closing of 500 local offices. News broadcasts report that unemployed workers in some areas are required to travel over 50 miles and wait as long as eight hours to receive services. The traditional one-to-one interviewer/job seeker delivery method insures that the hard pressed staff will be unable to offer much more service than the most cursory acceptance of a work registration. Given such grim alternatives, it would seem that grouping the job seekers into a self-help mode and assisting them to organize a well planned search for work offers a better solution to the hard pressed agency than prolonged waiting for individual interviews. Now, as we enter 1982, another far more severe round of budget cutting has been announced.

   Offering JST in ES local offices is, more than ever, an appropriate response to reduced staff and increased unemployment. The ES mandate--to facilitate the movement of workers into jobs--surely incorporates an activity that extends the knowledge and capability of the agency beyond the limits imposed by the traditional one-to-one method, and the traditional placement definition.

2. One deterrent, which accounted for the reluctant ES approach to JST nationally, was the national reward system which did not legitimize, or count, jobs obtained through any method other than a placement transaction wherein the agency acted as an intermediary between the worker and the job. Under the long-maintained definition of a countable "placement," jobs obtained by the clients themselves, though heavily assisted by the agency, had no reportable value. Hence, this service component is not in place nationally. In fact, California has been the only state in the union that provided JST, as a matter of priority and policy, for the flow of traffic in its local offices out of its basic employment service funds.

3. Recently, actions have been taken to legitimize JST in the employment service. Job search assistance, as it is called, is in the process of being established as a reportable service and an outcome category of "obtained employment" has been created. However, the establishment of a comparatively new, viable service component on a national scale is costly and time- consuming. In this period of emergency reactions to budget cuts, the change in national policy may not be actively pursued by many states.

The traditional system for rewarding credits has not been the only disincentive to the development of JST programs in ES. There are others that operate more subtly, but with powerful effect:

- To many employment security leaders, the mandate to ES is to operate a labor exchange. Teaching people to find jobs for themselves is seen as a violation of that essential role. In fact, often it is seen as directly competitive with the agency whose validity has for so long been measured solely by the number of countable placements it makes. A state director encapsulated the issue most succinctly. When asked by an ORC researcher if his agency conducted any JST program, he replied: "I should say not. Do you think we're crazy? That's just cutting our own throats. People getting their own jobs is our biggest competition."

- Large portions of the professional employment service staff are resistant to JST because it encroaches on their turf and on their claim to professional competency. As stated by one placement interviewer: "It took me years to learn my job. Don't tell me that welfare clients can learn to do it in a few weeks." The problem of professional turfism appears in all of the delivery systems.

- ES offices are generally crowded and often cannot easily accommodate JST programs in a separate space.

- The scheduling of JST programs is difficult and erratic, given the uneven flow of applicants. This can create a disruptive element in a local office.

- Programs require an initial investment of time and money in order to develop a broad word-of-mouth base before full utilization is attained.

- The ability to handle groups in a dynamic and energetic fashion is not one of the selection criteria for recruiting permanent employment service civil service staffs. Hence, agency staff do not offer a large pool of individuals with such skills or experiences. To recruit such staff would require changes in civil service specifications.

- Unlike CETA and WIN, ES has no "carrot" to offer clients in order to retain them for an extended period of supervised search and training. Though untested, it has been assumed that a job seeker would require some type of incentive, however small, to remain in a longer program.

Yet the employment service is the natural institution to offer some level of JST to the general public. Free of the requirement to limit participation to CETA-eligible or welfare clients, ES has access to individuals who, by definition, are looking for work at the moment, which is the best time to offer a JST program. At least, motivation is not confounded by stipends and other goals. And the employment service is a storehouse of information about the local market.

There are, in fact, a number of potential institutional incentives for the employment service to develop and install JST capability:

- A JST progam could improve the referral/hire ratio and increase placements by enhancing the ability of the referred applicant to deal with the interview.

- A well-run JST program can improve the marketing and public image of employment service with employers who complain about the presentation made by ES referrals. In fact, a number of employment service programs have used JST as an effective device for involving segments of the employer community in a helping role.

- A well-publicized and well-run JST program becomes a valid public service to the entire community and often draws a flow of participants through word-of-mouth that would normally not be inclined to use ES facilities. This was especially evident in one program which was targeted for professionals changing occupations.

- There is strong evidence that the public likes and appreciates a JST service. Too often, ES has been seen as the agency that tells people, "No, there's no job for you." Offering JST allows the agency to say to everyone, "Yes, we can help you."

The effects of the institutional restraints on the employment service are clearly evident in the delivery model that was most commonly found there. Programs are short, never exceeding 15 hours a week, filled with much lecturing and little training, with a strong labor-market orientation. It is doubtful whether the longer cycle models in WIN and CETA are replicable in ES for flow of traffic clients. It is difficult to conceive of unsupported, voluntary job seekers being willing to accept the demands for full-time search activity that are of the type imposed by a welfare or stipended program.

Implementation of "Obtained Employment"

Though ES has now moved towards validating an "obtained employment" outcome category, the implementation process involves a number of critical problems which are under discussion. Because of the knowledge gained in the course of this study, ORC staff believe they can contribute some useful insights to that dialogue, and raise questions that might be productively pursued.

The most difficult problem appears to be the development of a follow-up system to verify job finding outcomes. Unlike the process of verifying regular ES placements, the job search training relationship is not with employers who can be easily contacted at the place of business within a few days of referral to determine whether someone has started working. Instead, JST participants must be contacted at their homes several weeks after commencing their job search.

Some insights on follow-up techniques, as well as on likely JST outcomes, are provided by examining a recent survey conducted by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) related to its program.

JST Follow-up Survey in California

In the summer of 1980 EDD undertook to obtain some level of hard data about JST outcomes. The California agency has been conducting JSW (the term in EDD is "Job Search Workshops") as an "act of faith" for a number of years. Since no credit was given to the agency for providing the service, the activity has been a cost-only item. The state has required local offices to report regularly on the following three items only:

JSW Field Office Activity

	FY 1978-79	FY 1979-80
Number of participants	76,738	87,102
Number of workshop cycles	7,374	7,976
Sessions	unavailable	10,771

An activity code was assigned in order to capture all staff time chargeable to JSW. In FY 1979-80, 34,274 hours were charged statewide under that code. This is equivalent to about 19 person years of work, or less than 1 percent of the 2,213 total person years worked by EDD staff during that year.

Not only did the traditional placement definition for reportable outcomes give state officials no incentive to determine JSW outcomes, but any follow-up activity to arrive at outcome figures actually incurred additional costs. Nevertheless, a number of local offices, on their own initiative, did keep their sign-up sheets and regularly sent out follow-up letters fo JSW participants two months after attendance, requesting responses. The volume and quality of responses shown to ORC researchers by some workshop leaders and by state officials suggested that further follow-up efforts might be productive.

Both ORC and state EDD officials were intrigued by the question, what if the placement definition were broadened to include "placement assists" and jobs obtained by participants became reportable revenue-producing outcomes, whether obtained by self-directed or agency efforts, as has been the practice in both WIN and CETA? To address this issue, a low-cost evaluation plan evolved which would require little additional effort from field staff but would nevertheless provide some insight into JSW outcomes. EDD agreed to conduct a statewide mail follow-up survey 30 days after the JSW experience, with standardized survey questions. The critical outcome question asked if the respondents were working at the time they received the questionnaire card. The name and address of the employer and the starting wage were also requested. Other survey questions sought the opinions of the JSW participants regarding the value of the workshop to them. The three-month survey period was set for June, July, and August of 1980.

EDD was understandably unwilling to undertake any expensive follow-up beyond mailing the survey card. Therefore, the survey design had to depend entirely on voluntary responses, without even the ability to sample the non-respondents. The latter would have to be assumed to be "not employed" or negative outcomes. The number of respondents reporting employment would then be displayed against the entire universe of JSW participants to arrive at an "at least" outcome measure, i.e., at least this many found jobs. If the response rate were to be enlarged by any means, the success rate could only go up, since the minimum number obtaining jobs had already been determined.

Results of the Survey

Of 151 field offices, 123 participated in the survey. Survey cards were sent to 13,094 participants. There was considerable variation in when and how JSW leaders explained the importance of the survey and requested responses from participants. The response rate was 35 percent and 34 percent of all who responded were employed.

Using the "at least" criteria, 12 percent of all JSW participants surveyed were employed. Considering that the 123 offices charged 7,533 hours worked to the JSW code during the three-month period and at least 1,563 individuals obtained employment, the very conservative estimate is that "at most" 4.8 hours of staff time were invested for each employed participant. Even though it could only be taken as indicative rather than definitive, EDD found this to be a reassuring result. If the response could be taken as representative (which, of course, they realized it could not without a further probing of the nonrespondents), the total number employed would have been 4,450 and the staff hours per employed participant would have been 1.7 compared to the 11.6 staff hours per placement for all EDD placement activities.

Of those who answered the opinion question, 82 percent responded positively and considered the workshop helpful. No data are available on the relationship between positive results and becoming employed, except that more people responded positively than were actually employed.

The three-month survey was a first attempt, somewhat hastily mounted, and lacked tight instruction to field staff. But, the survey offers a valuable starting place to consider potential problems connected with installing a regular follow-up system in the ES. It also offers the first indications of the potential value of JST in the ES, suggesting that staff allocated to JST activities may more than earn their keep if the outcomes are counted for budget purposes.

Outcomes Issues

The establishment of national standards for any institution involved with JST, and most particularly the ES, requires decisions about basic questions: Who is to be counted? What measure should be used? When should the measurement be made? How should the data be collected? The following observations emerge from the state of the art study.

Who is to be Counted?

What is the criteria by which a person is considered a participant in a JST program? Is it to be everyone who is enrolled and attends the first session, or the major portion of a cycle, or only those who complete the program? This is a difficult question in JST because the effects of the intervention are so amorphous and varied. Yet, unless there is a standard by which 'participation' is determined, outcome data becomes meaningless.

People who do not complete a cycle may have dropped out for a variety of reasons, including going to work. Even a short amount of training in how to conduct an interview, for example, may be very instrumental in assisting the person to get the job. It has been observed that the 'get-going' effects of even an initial session have resulted in people getting jobs.

ORC, in its youth demonstration project, considered all who attended the first morning of the two full-day programs, or about 25 percent of the cycle, as being 'participants' for follow-up purposes. The logic was based on the fact that a good portion of the curriculum and considerable personal attention to the work application was accomplished in the very beginning. The ES national office designated that reportable JST activity required eight hours of instruction.* For follow-up purposes, a person might be regarded as a participant if one-half of the cycle--a half-day--were attended by a job seeker. In longer programs, such as those found in WIN and CETA, different criteria may be more appropriate.

What Outcome Measures Should be Used?

This question goes to the heart of JST goals and the employment problem it purports to address. In ORC observers' view, the intervention is primarily addressed to reducing the period of unemployment. Most JST programs are not primarily addressed to getting a better job, or retaining a job longer, though there is some evidence that this may occur. Though some programs claim long-term goals of teaching life-time job search skills, there is presently no way to ascertain whether or not this occurs.

Some observations on measures follow:

- The EDD survey asked whether a person was employed thirty days after workshop attendance. If people had found jobs and left them before the thirty day survey, they would not be counted as successful outcomes. The implication is that participants will not only find a job but will also retain them longer because of JST. Thus, using employment at a certain time after JST as the outcome criteria does not appear to be the most suitable measure for ES programs. A more appropriate measure in ES is simply to ask whether and when the person went to work after the workshop, without regard to how long the job was retained. Such measures are essentially identical to those used for a regular ES placement. To be counted, the placement need not last longer than it takes a person to go on to (and off of) the payroll. The critical outcome measures should not go beyond the limitations of a short-term, low cost intervention.

---

*The eight-hour standard is puzzling from a field point of view. As a practical matter, a day of job search training typically starts at 9:00 a.m. and ends at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m., with an hour for lunch. Longer than that exhausts everyone and makes administration difficult.

- Other outcome data can provide valuable information such as the name of the employer, the occupation, the wage rate, the duration of the job, and how each individual first learned about the opening where the person went to work.

- Some level of double count may occur between JST outcomes and formal placements. Though this may be estimated, it is important to understand that the goal of JST is to improve the job finding experience for all job seekers, some of whom may well have learned how to be more effective in using ES itself, just as they learn to be more effective in the use of the newspaper want ads and their networks of friends and relatives.

- One measure which can be of great value is the participant's opinion of the JST service. This data can be helpful as a monitoring aid to maintain and improve the quality of the program.

- Measuring outcomes in WIN and CETA JST programs have ramifications which add additional dimensions to the problem. The welfare recipient programs understandably emphasize job retention in order to keep people off of welfare, but even the WIN programs report two figures--the number of participants finding employment and the rate of retention after a certain time period.

- The CETA concept of "positive terminations" is really another set of outcome measures since returning to school or entering another program is regarded as a positive termination along with obtaining employment. The effect of the "positive termination" outcome concept has confounded the success claims of many JST programs operating under the CETA aegis in the field. This was one factor that reduced the ability of ORC to deal with comparable data.

How Soon After JST Participation Begins Should the Outcome be Measured?

The problem of timing is critical and seriously affects the level of outcomes reported.* The question is to find the balance between, on the one hand, allowing enough time for the maximum impact of the intervention to become manifest and on the other hand, not extending the time interval beyond a period when a reasonable assumption can be made that the JST programs had a causal relationship to the job obtained. The fact is, the longer the period between the intervention and the follow-up, the more individuals will have obtained work. In studies of unemployment insurance claimants, it is found that by six months, 85 percent will have left the unemployment insurance program and it is a fair assumption that the large bulk will have done so because they found jobs, with or without any intervention.

---

*Wide variations were found in the field in the follow-up time periods. These variations were not only found between programs in different institutions (CETA, WIN, and ES), but also to a degree between programs within the same institution. These variations produce non-comparable data and were an additional factor making comparison of outcomes impossible in this study.

In the evaluation of ORC's youth demonstration project--JOB TRACK--it was found that the biggest impact of the intervention occurred at about the fifth week. Beyond that period, the curves represented by the comparison group and the treatment group tended to come together. Similar findings were reported by the evaluation of the Cambridge Job Factory for Youth program.

The California EDD survey was conducted at four weeks which may be a little short of capturing the maximum benefits. Six weeks seems to be a reasonable compromise.

What Is the Most Reliable and Least Costly System for Collecting Outcome Data?

It is clear from the years of experience with participant follow-ups that no system can produce anything comparable to the kind of 100 percent verification required for recording ES placements in ESARS. An attempt to obtain that level of response from participants would become prohibitively expensive. More importantly, in the end, all attempts will merely produce samples anyway. Some samples, of course, are far less reliable than others.

The EDD experience suggests 35 percent as a likely response rate for a follow-up system whereby the cards are mailed to the participants at a specific follow-up point after the JST program appearance. The system proposed by the ES national office is to hand the card to participants at the close of the workshop and hope that they mail them in. Such a system is certain to produce a far lower response rate than the 35 percent in the EDD survey. In the end, both of these card systems are going to produce highly unreliable outcome estimates. DOL policy sets a 75 percent response rate as the minimum standard for good survey work and usually won't even permit publication of a survey with a response rate below 50 percent.

The least costly and most reliable data collection method for JST outcomes would be to use the smallest sample statistically representative of the participant universe. Experience with small sample follow-ups suggests that it may be possible to achieve the 75 percent response rate. Actually, mailed cards could be used in conjunction with telephone calls. Initially, cards could be sent to all of the participants in the selected sample, followed by phone calls to those who didn't respond. To reach the 75 percent response rate would require persistence, including the willingness and ability to phone after work hours, but it can be done.

A major dilemma inherent in the use of a sampling system is that a small sample which produced highly reliable estimates of job finding rates for an overall state program would undoubtedly be inadequate for producing separate estimates by local office. Yet the participant opinion data is valuable primarily because it provides feedback on the quality of each individual program. One way out of the dilemma might be to send out opinion cards to all participants, in order to gain a broad base of participant responses, at relatively low cost. This would have to be a separate function, answering a different purpose, than the sampling system designed to gain the most reliable estimates of total employment associated with attendance at JST workshops.

One thing appears certain, however. Neither the placement verification method nor the follow-up criteria used in CETA and WIN offer sensible models for ES. Substantial experimentation with follow-up methods particularly appropriate for JST is needed in the ES before a final reporting method is adopted. In turn, a final reporting system must be validated and adopted before funds can be allocated for JST based on any measure of productivity, or "entered employment." Until that time, JST supported levels must be determined by a direct allocation method.

Cost Issues

A number of JST cost issues surfaced in the course of the ORC study which may not be readily perceived in initial program planning. Among them are the size of the group, the extent to which the program is utilized, the length of the cycle, and payments made to participants.

Size of Groups

All JSTs plan their operations around what they consider to be the optimal or feasible size of the group during a cycle. Program operators disagree about what size they consider optimal. Some insist that a group that exceeds ten participants is unwieldy and loses the "workshop" quality. In their view, the group becomes a classroom and personalization becomes impossible. Azrin indicates a limit of 12 because the counselor can't give enough individual attention to each participant in a larger group. Others insist that if a group falls below fifteen, it loses vitality, gets dull, and adversely affects staff and participant morale. ORC observed spirited and dull groups of varied sizes, though groups with less than five do tend to become demoralized. The skill of the group leader to personalize the curriculum material, and the dynamism and energy injected by the leader appeared to be a more important factor than the size of the group.

However, apart from the effect that group size may have on the quality of the program, it is a critical cost factor. Like all other overhead costs, staff hours are relatively stable. Staff are allocated in relation to the anticipated group size, the length of the program, and the importance that the institution places on the activity, or the self-interests of the contractor. The Self-Directed Placement Corporation which, at the time of this report, had 19 contracts to deliver JST, insists that the sponsoring organization insure groups of at least 25 people for each cycle. In its view, it loses money when groups consist of less than 15 participants. However, as a private-for-profit corporation, its overhead costs are apt to be higher than they might be in a government institution where JST is one of many functions. Without a doubt, however, the planned group size is an important factor when considering costs. ORC observed groups that ranged from two to 33.

Underutilization

ORC found that about half of the programs were underutilized--the groups were consistently smaller than had been planned. Even in WIN, staff overscheduled by 50 percent in order to assure full attendance. Underutilization is a significant cost item. Staff hours, space, and equipment are geared to serving a given number of people. If the group consistently falls below the planned size, the cost per participant rises. The biggest problem appeared to be the drop-offs between sign-up and show-up. Dropouts were, surprisingly, not considered a serious problem in either stipended or non-stipended programs.

ORC staff were also startled to find that no consistent relationship existed between underutilization and the payment of stipends or allowancse. Of the programs that were fully utilized, more than one-half were ES programs with no payments to participants.

Program operators offered a number of explanations for the underutilization of their programs. Generally, these related to internal recruitment processes, turf fighting for eligible populations, and technical problems such as time lag between the referral and the start of the program. What day of the week a program began seemed to be an important factor. Some operators found that moving the starting day to Wednesday helped increase attendance.

There were strong feelings prevalent among JST staff, whether in CETA, WIN, or ES, that staff responsible for recruitment and referral to JST were either hostile to the idea, lax in their efforts, or tended to "dump" their least motivated, least employable clients, reserving those more easily placed for placement staff, who also have outcomes concerns. Some programs made deliberate efforts to overcome the resistance of the referring staff by arranging for their attendance at JST sessions to encourage more awareness of the value of the program.

A more universal explanation offered for underutilization was the perceived over-saturation of employability offerings in an area, directed essentially to the same group. For example, the ORC/EDD Youth Demonstration project was designed for unstipended, out-of-school youth who came to ES looking for a job. The central youth office is jointly administered by ES and the CETA prime. Initially, the attendance at JOB TRACK was heavy. Shortly after its initiation, a stipended PIC program open to youth was instituted. At the same time, summer youth jobs were being offered, and CBOs were looking for youth to fulfill their contracts. Predictably, attendance at JOB TRACK dropped significantly. Evidence of programs doing battle to fulfill their quotas, struggling for proprietorship over the same persons, could be found at many sites.

In examining those programs that did not appear to have any consistent problems of utilization, certain characteristics surfaced:

1. Programs in existence for a longer period, such as some of the ES programs in California, had over time developed a wide word-of-mouth base and were no longer dependent upon internal referrals to run at or near capacity. Referrals come from former participants and from other

institutions in the community. Regular EDD referring staff also developed a greater awareness and respect for the program and its value as previously referred clients reported a favorable experience. Yet, there were utilization problems initially. Clearly, JST programs take time to develop, mature, and draw an adequate number of clients.

2. Programs that are well-publicized and develop a general community awareness and a constituency draw clients directly to them from many sources including employer referrals.

3. Programs that are centralized and mix clients appeared to have fewer utilization problems. The more narrowly targeted the group, the more the problem emerged.

4. Ambience appeared to have much to do with utilization. "Spiffy" programs with pleasant environments, conductive to relaxation, establish reputations that make them preferable to other kinds of employability and training offerings. Though this is not a decisive factor, it seemed to ORC observers that such programs drew and retained clients more easily.

5. Consistent attention to all of the facets of recruitment seem to be productive. For example, continuous contact with the referring staff--a news letter, a joint meeting--is effective. Group leaders pre-interviewing each referral, attention paid to exactly how the invitation is made and what precisely is offered, feedback to counselors and placement interviewers--all seem to bear fruit.

The broader question of underutilization can well be of concern to policy makers. Why is this a problem? Is JST really needed, if there is no visible public demand for the service among those who are the targets of employability programs? Actually, the conscious need of that population is for a job, or for training. It is not for a teaching program about how to get a job. The inability of government programs to provide the professional one-to-one service is the major reason that people must learn to do it for themselves. For job seekers to become aware of JST, it would be necessary that they also be made aware of the depleted level of free, professional, government-provided help. There needs to be a change of public consciousness about the individual's own role in the job-getting processes. A deliberate campaign to change public awareness and create the need for JST is a necessary ingredient for the full development of such an offering. JST and its value need to be "sold."

In sum, progams take time to evolve, to develop a wide word-of-mouth base, to stabilize. Programs must devote time and energy to the recruitment effort, and that effort must be extended to the general public. Dependence on referrals from internal sources only does not supply an adequate flow of participants to sustain many programs. Even in mandated WIN programs, potential clients should hear of their value through sources other than WIN staff, to overcome the punitive implications. Programs should be well-administered, professionally run, well-appointed, and inviting. All of these are cost factors that must be taken into consideration by policy makers and administrators, if JST is to become a fully utilized, successful public service.

Length of Cycle

Certain critical cost factors appear to be interrelated--the length of program cycles, supervised search time, payments to participants, staffing, and space. Among the 30 sites visited, ORC encountered no JST effort with a cycle of 15 hours or less that paid anything to participants or supervised the actual search effort. Conversely, all programs with a cycle exceeding 15 hours did include search supervision and some form of cash incentive to the clients. Since a supervised search usually involves the use of the telephone, the installation of telephones and adequate space is another cost. Among the longer programs, the cycle lasted anywhere from two to seven weeks. It seemed to ORC observers that many programs proceeded at a pace of uncommon leisure, and were somewhat inflated and spongy. Outside of WIN, the longest programs were those delivered by commercial firms, for whom a longer program is a distinct advantage. Their prominence in the field does confound the question of what the optimum cycle length might be.

A number of questions arise which cannot be answered by this study, but which should be addressed in the future:

- What is the relationship between outcomes, costs, and the length of a JST cycle?
- Is it possible to develop a model which would incorporate some type of supervised search and actual training in job search skills in a one-week cycle?
- Is it possible to attract and retain non-supported clients for a period that exceeds 15 hours?

At this point, there is no evidence to support the proposition that a six-week program is more effective than one that runs for two weeks. The severe reduction in available resources makes the questions about program length particularly relevant now.

Payments to Participants

As has been previously stated, the question of full stipends for JST may now be entirely academic. Nevertheless, the issue is important for reasons that go beyond costs. The "carrot-stick" question and its impact on participants in employability programs has been argued ever since programs began. The dilemma is that the payment of stipends tends to effect who gets into programs and how they are run, sometimes adversely. And yet, without payments of some type or other, an essentially poor population could not sustain a prolonged training effort. Looking for work does cost money, and the dynamics of being forced to do so in group-supported form often changes motivation and does overcome inertia and fear. It is unfortunate that the only alternatives that were available in CETA were full stipends or nothing, and in ES it is nothing. A simple expense fund which would enable job seekers to conduct a search for work may prove to be highly cost effective.

Summary

Though the administrative issues surrounding a JST program extend beyond those discussed in this chapter, some important elements that affect outcome measurements and costs have been probed. Success percentages are dependent upon what is regarded as the universe of participants, what is regarded as success, and when it can be attributed to the JST program. Success measures are also somewhat dependent on the methods used to obtain the information and the assiduousness with which follow-up is pursued. A special EDD follow-up study was reviewed. Despite its limitations, it offers the most convincing evidence available of the potential effectiveness of JST as an ES program.

While it is true that JST is far less costly than other types of employability programs, it is also a fact that the goals of JST are much narrower than many of the others, such as occupational skill training. Yet JST has important cost issues--start up, length of cycle, underutilization, size of group, and participant payments--which are all interrelated and affect other costs such as staffing and space requirements. Given scarce resources, experimentation is needed to determine whether the cost effectiveness of existing models can be improved.

There is a clear need for the establishment of sound and workable outcome measures and standards that are applicable to any delivery system. Who is to be counted, what is to be counted, when, and how the data will be gathered need to be thought through, tried, and standardized. This concern is especially critical in the ES as it attempts to implement the "obtained employment" concept. Arbitrarily lifting methods appropriate for the placement function onto JST, a very different kind of intervention, could so burden field operators and prove so costly as to destroy the program. Also, concepts lifted from a case work, medical model operation such as WIN or CETA have little operating relevance to an ES market model. Prematurely establishing a ratio of "obtained employment" outcomes to placement outcomes could result in either discouraging the placement function or, conversely, discouraging development of JST programs. Clearly, a period of experimentation is necessary.

For policy makers, critical research questions remain unanswered. Only four studies have used comparison or control group designs: the 1976 five-city Azrin study, the Texas study of WIN programs, the Brandeis University study of Job Factory for Youth, and the ORC youth demonstration project, JOB TRACK. The first two compared JST to regular WIN services--one intervention compared to another. Only the last two compared JST to groups that received no other designated service.

In a program like JST, where the agency is not directly involved in the hiring transaction, there is always a persistent, nagging question about whether, to what degree, and when people would have obtained jobs without that intervention. To answer that question adequately would require an experimental design with a non-treated control group. Ideally, the design would make a three-way comparison--JST, traditional agency service, and no treatment. Until that is done, the contribution of JST towards moving workers more rapidly into jobs will have to stand on less convincing evidence. Given the current incursion on the institutions, budgets, and staffs of delivery systems, relatively low cost job search training may rise in importance among the public services remaining for the unemployed population. These questions do need answers.

Chapter III

TEACHING ENVIRONMENT AND METHODS

Central to job search training, whatever its administrative base, are the environment within which the training occurs, the instructional methods used, and the curriculum taught. In this chapter, the focus is on what takes place in the JST groups between leader and participants, the methods used by leaders, and the general flavor of the experience. The two chapters that follow deal with the curriculum. They divide the content between instructions leading up to the job search and the job search itself.

ORC staff decided that the technique of participant observation is the most natural and least disruptive one to apply when making site visits. It allows the observer to share the experiences and impressions of the participants, and, at the same time, provide the group with an honest explanation for the presence of the observer and "note-taker." Group leaders were asked to introduce the ORC observer and explain the purpose of the visit in low-keyed fashion, deemphasizing the national aspect of the study and the reasons for selecting the site. Many leaders did as asked, but others chose to make no introduction and offered no explanation for the presence of a "note-taker." As participants, ORC staff engaged in the group activities, completed many work applications and resumes, took the required tests, practiced interviews before the video, played "get acquainted" games, and joined in the discussions when appropriate. On occasion, leaders called on the knowledge and expertise of ORC staff to assist in the training process.

Aside from content, the ORC researchers focused their observations on the following major questions:

- What messages are imparted to participants through the physical environment?
- What is the interaction between leaders and participants? What roles do leaders assume? What use is made of the group?
- Who are the participants? How are they mixed? What generally is their response to the program?
- Who are the group leaders? What has influenced them? What knowledge and orientation shapes the program?
- What view of the clients does the progam impart, overtly and implicitly?

The data analyzed here are based entirely on the 30 site visits. Observers spent anywhere from one day to a full week at a site, depending on the length of the program, the agreement made with the program operator, and the constraints of resources. Site visits included both formal and informal exchanges with group leaders and participants. Observations generally favored the classroom phase of the program, with far less time spent observing the supervised search phase. No direct observations were possible in two of the sites because of the proprietary concerns of the operators.

The analysis is basically impressionistic, though objective information and quantification were sought wherever possible. ORC observers brought to the task an uncommon background of knowledge and experience in group processes, teaching methods, psychological theory, and qualitative research skills, as well as previous experience with job search assistance. However, the greatest value of participant observation is that the observer is sharing the experience with the participants while in the program.

The Physical Environment

A wide assortment of buildings, neighborhoods, and settings greeted ORC observers, imparting very different messages about the importance of the program, the degree of institutional support, how participants were viewed, and how they were expected to behave toward the program. Five of the programs, including two conducted by commercial firms, considered the ambience a critical factor affecting the program message and participant response. One program operator said, "We want these people to feel that they have now become part of the successful world of business. We insist that our leaders dress like professionals, our rooms are carpeted, our equipment is first rate, the plants, paintings, all are designed to make people feel that they are already 'in'--already part of the working world." Another leader insisted that participant self-image is strongly enhanced when the decor and settings are imparting a sense that "this program isn't a mickey mouse putdown. It's expensive, and highly professional. That's because you're worth it."

ORC observers came to agree that the setting, the seating arrangement, the organization of space, the areas designated for socializing and coffee drinking, the degree of distance and separation between leaders and participants all had significant impact and imparted potent hidden messages. Though vital and spirited programs were sometimes conducted in drab and discouraging settings, the leader had a difficult task overcoming the impact of the initial impression.

Employment service and WIN programs operated within the regular offices of the agency. In about half of the ES programs, JST had no permanent "home," and used a borrowed room for the session, a major complaint of ES leaders since they could not decorate or arrange the space to soften the effects of "institutional grey." The permanently assigned areas reflected the activity with wall decorations, charts, equipment, library, and seating arrangements. However, the ES and WIN programs generally were set within a functioning office and participants usually entered and left by walking through the larger area. Generally, this precluded the availability of an area for the participants to socialize at coffee breaks either with each other or with group leaders.

In CETA, JST settings varied widely, ranging from donated, somewhat dingy classrooms in an Army Reserve building or the Voluntary Fire Department, to what might be considered optimal conditions in modern offices--ample space, carpeted floors, windows, thoughtful appointments and decorations, with specially designed telephone room cubicles. Commercial firms with more than one contract to provide JST services were the most concerned with decor.

ORC observers found themselves reacting along with the participants to the "hidden message" of physical environments which ignored the esthetic sensibilities and physical comfort of the participants with no evident attempt to alleviate the force of dreary circumstances. These did, indeed, create a sense of 'mickey mouse' programs, thrown together carelessly, with leaders apt to "do their own thing," very nearly oblivious of their own impact or the effect the physical environment was having on the group.

However, the plushness of the setting is, of itself, not as critical to the total impact of the program as is the organization of the space, especially as it reflects the relationship between professional staff and participants. A description of two programs will serve to make the point.

Program A, a resource center, assigns most of the available and quite ample space for the convenience and use of the participants. The kitchen or coffee area is shared by staff and participants and becomes a focal point for socializing, both among clients and between clients and staff. People get to know one another, and the formation of the group often occurs more rapidly and more effectively in that setting. Free coffee is provided, and almost from the first day clients are invited to participate in keeping the area clean, washing the dishes, making the coffee, running errands, and generally sharing in the housekeeping and operations of the Center. The Center becomes their own. Independence, equality between staff and client, and active participation in making something happen are not just words. They are enacted at every moment. In the classroom, the leaders had no difficulty in maintaining control, and in asserting their rational authority over the curriculum. There was a clear consistency between the implicit message and the overt one, "You are a valid, independent, adult person who is expected to contribute, just as you are expected to act on your own behalf in getting a job. Our authority here is rationally determined--we are not better than you. We simply have knowledge you don't have which we are happy to share."

On the other hand, Program B has a suite of nine offices, of which one is used as a classroom and another as a telephoning room. The rest are closed-door private offices for staff, except for one small room that contains a coffee machine and water cooler for participants, and a room that serves as a central reception area. The reception room is off limits to the clients, though staff congregate in the area. In fact, when the ORC observer was talking with a young male participant in the reception area, the director came by and curtly informed the young man that he would have to leave, that they couldn't have people sitting around because it would look like a "dentist's waiting room." No area was made available for the social use of participants. Socializing between staff and clients was discouraged. Leaders conducted groups from a podium. A staff specialist interviewed each person and then supplied a prepared "package" of selling points to be offered to the employer, somewhat like a commercial resume-producing firm. All participants were instructed about what to put on their application forms, whether the information was true or not.

The behavior was rationalized as an emulation of the boss-employee relationship, as conceived by the director. However, classroom instruction was full of "hype," replete with talk of independence, "do it yourself," "be on your own." The overt program goals--to enhance self-image, reduce dependency, increase assertiveness--were continuously belied by and in direct contradiction to the hidden messages imparted by the use of space and other subtleties.

Clearly, the participants were more comfortable in Program A. People lingered, talked together, made friends, laughed, overcame shyness, spoke up, shared. Whether the greater comfort is translatable into a more active and productive search for work, whether more jobs are obtained, or obtained more quickly, cannot be determined by this study. Both programs claimed respectable success rates. But atmosphere and setting does, indeed, effect the ability of a program to attract and retain participants, to develop a good reputation in the community, and a wide "word-of-mouth" base.

Overview--Description of JST Methods

As with the ambience, the style, tone and teaching methods adopted by the 30 programs vary widely, and either serve to reinforce or conflict with the overt goals of the program. Most JSTs assert that they use the group approach not only to save costs but also to use the group itself as a socializing, motivational element in the design.* Yet, programs differ markedly in how effective they are in making use of the group format. The ensuing material categorizes the non-substantial JST processes.

Amenities

This category includes the time spent in introductions, discussions about administrative and housekeeping issues, setting up contract relationships between program administrators and participants, arranging for payments, coffee breaks, graduation exercises, and similar non-curricular exchanges.

All of the programs had some element of such activities, occupying from three to 19 percent of classroom time. In short programs, such as those found in ES, this element was barely present, if at all. People were seldom introduced to one another and, since the groups are voluntary and unstipended, no contractual relationship between participant and leader was implied beyond courtesy.

---

*Dr. Nathan Azrin, in a speech in Indianapolis, September 4, 1980, which was recorded, does state that the group format in Job Clubs is used only because it is cheaper. He does not regard it as a key positive factor and considers the group less effective than one-to-one counseling.

In programs involving payment to clients, however, the tone is often, but not always, set by the "boss/worker" relationship that is established at that point. Time clocks, warnings, threats of docked pay, and "firings," "production" criteria, contracts--all are designed to establish that participants are now "employed" and are expected to produce. The dichotomy between the subordinated "employee" role and the verbiage in the rest of the program, urging independence, assertiveness, and self-help, is an inherent double-message problem. Some programs are more restrained than others in asserting the "boss" role and more successful in reconciling the dichotomy.

Morale-Raising/Group-Building Activities

Presumably, the entire program is designed to raise morale. However, in this category are those activities, games, and exercises which are specifically introduced for the purpose of welding the group and raising self-image, and are unrelated to the curriculum content. They could just as well be used in any group work. They include films such as the widely used "You Pack Your Own Chute," which deals with fear and independence; ice-breaking exercises intended to introduce people to one another for group cohesiveness and relaxation; assertiveness exercises; "bragging" exercises; three-minute TV commercials of one's non-job related virtues; "I am proud because. . ." exercises. Except for the introductions, these are interspersed throughout the program.

About half of the programs spent anywhere from 4 to 19 percent of their classroom time on such activities. Again, ES programs were generally devoid of such efforts, except those with CETA stipends. The JSTs that devoted a larger portion of their time to such activities tended to be those using the "sales" psychology approach where the main job-finding problem is seen as one of selling oneself by making the employer "like you." These exercises have apparently been widely circulated and are passed from program to program since ORC staff found the same material appearing in many different JSTs.

Teaching--Imparting Information

Most of the JST programs, particularly the short ES model, offered information in a highly structured classroom style with a quite rigid curriculum governing the time and content. Information was imparted in straight lecture format, intrespersed occasionally with "brainstorming" to elicit group response, administered in controlled and orchestrated fashion, with the aid of a flip chart. Visual aids, written handouts, and exercises were sometimes used. Within that general format, however, there were wide differences between programs.

Another format, seen less frequently, can be characterized as the workshop model. In its purest form, this is a loose, semi-structured activity in which the curriculum is extremely flexible, and the needs and problems verbalized in the group largely determine agenda emphasis. Discussion, participation, and the surfacing of feelings regarding the job search are encouraged. Though the leader has the responsibility of providing information, the experiences of the group are called forth and used as a base. The leader's role is that of facilitator and consultant to a self-help group, and social support from the group is fostered and encouraged. ORC staff observed only one program that was fully committed to the workshop method, though a number attempted to combine the workshop and classroom approaches.

Job Clubs that are based on theories of behavioral psychology reject both the lecture and workshop formats. They are unconcerned with teaching a body of information or eliciting group participation. The original model subscribes to a theory of learning which holds that the desired behavior is attained through practicing, through enforced repetition, while providing positive reinforcement during the process. The model has a one-minute rule--leaders are required to limit their general presentation of a topic to one minute (Azrin and Besalel, 1980). Participants are almost immediately involved in performing prescribed activities related to job finding. The leader is required to maintain a continuous stream of directive counseling and support to each individual in the group, in rotation, spending only a few minutes at a time with each. In the Indianapolis speech previously mentioned, Azrin stated, "If the counselor is silent, he or she is not doing the job." There is no effort, in this model, to elicit participant attitudes or to form a group. However, considerable departures were observed from the prescribed format in Azrin-originated programs. The Texas evaluation also noted many violations of the Azrin manual. Essentially, the Azrin model is devoid of a teaching or knowledge-imparting element and rests entirely on shaping behavior.

Training--Imparting Skills

Training here refers to the process whereby people translate knowledge into action by practicing the new behavior until it is perfected and internalized. In JST this involves four areas: how to conduct an interview, talk on the telephone, complete a work application, and design a resume. The skill of questioning people in informational interviewing was also dealt with briefly in a few of the visited programs. In most programs, training in the use of the telephone was part of the supervised search phase of the program, while interviewing, application completion and resumes were essentially a classroom activity. Most short ES programs do not engage in any training activity, though participants are urged to practice interviewing and telephone techniques at home.

Training methods vary in use and in effectiveness. ORC staff observed the following techniques:

- Paired practice of interviewing or telephoning, using "stress" questions.
- Video taping of the interviewing or telephoning, using "stress" questions.
- Exchanges between the leader and one participant at a time before the group--role playing--for interviewing and phone practice.
- Small group exercises.
- Classroom paper exercises.
- Homework assignments, writing, and drawing.
- Tape recording.
- Role playing with visiting employers or other staff.
- Listener devices on the telephone for training purposes.

Selections from four case study reports by ORC observers illustrate the use of these methods:

> Each participant had the opportunity of going through one or two mock phone calls with the leader who acted as the employer. Each person had a standard script form before them at their seats. The leader had an engaging technique of beginning each 'call' by

> saying, "Ring, ring. Barnes and Noble," or some other company familiar to the group. He then addressed each person's particular 'sore points' such as lack of experience, long period of unemployment, etc. He was interested in having them just get through the first phone call, and was careful to point out when someone did something right. They were nervous and made mistakes. But gradually they began to state their qualifications more confidently.
>
> The interview practice was somewhat weak. People were paired, with one acting as the interviewer. Each person ended up pretending to hire the other--no one got turned down. The experience was not very real and probably not very helpful.
>
> We all go into a separate room to watch the video replays. The only instruction we are given in what is usually a 'critique' session is to make only positive remarks about ourselves and others. 'We're all trained to be critical. This time, look for the things you like instead.' First the person on the tape makes comments about him/herself, then others make comments. A dramatic change now takes place in the group. It welds together. People come through this session feeling good about themselves since something good was pointed out in every case. There's a purpose--at its base it builds self-confidence.
>
> During the replays, the leader, sitting at the back of the room, operates a device that allows him to stop the tape when he chooses to make a point. He and the other leader are the only ones who comment on the performances. Critiques from the group were not elicited. Instead, written anonymous forms were used to elicit whatever comments they were generating but not expressing. Once again, the potential for developing a group sense is rejected in favor of maintaining distance and authority between staff and participants.

ORC staff did observe that some leaders who were decidedly unimpressive in the teaching role were considerably more effective in the training role, particularly in the telephone room. A quiet, undynamic personality can be deadly before the group, but the same quiet quality may become a very real asset when providing individual assistance and advice.

Program operators defined a number of purposes served by the training process:

- Making cold calls on the telephone is very alien to most people. They need practice just to become familiar with a more "pushy" role than one they are normally accustomed to.

- Fear and nervousness, in both telephoning and interviewing, are confronted in the practice sessions. Mechanically learning what to say, with scripts, packaged statements, reduces the tension as language is repeated.

- The video tape recording of the practice interviews is the most effective and extensively used device for improving interviewing skills. Program operators maintain that it provides convincing visual evidence of both the self-defeating behavior and of the improvement, when used at the beginning and at the end. ORC observers reported repeated examples of visible behavior changes following the video experience. In all tests of participant responses, the video is regarded as the most useful part of the training.

Impressions and Comments

A teacher or trainer provides the group with a role model. The tone that prevades the experience and the kind of behavior expected from the group is modeled by the leader, no matter what words are actually said. Just as the job seeker is taught how subtle messages, body language, facial expressions, and tone of voice affect the employment interview, just so the leader's non-verbal communication affects the group. A lecture, in and of itself, is neither 'good' nor 'bad.' One lecturer with solid information to offer, may do so in such a fashion as to impart the feeling that "I'm going to do my thing. Whether it interests you or not is no concern of mine, so long as you are quiet. If you speak up, you're intruding." Another lecturer, with the same material, can create an exciting, thought-provoking, funny experience which thoroughly engages the group, and interaction, group identity, and participation begins almost immediately.

A classroom/lecture format is not generally conducive to discussion and debate when there are time constraints and curriculum commitments. Though "brain-storming" provides a temporary shift from passive listening, too often leaders used this method mechanically, giving the appearance of inviting participant responses, but actually emulating a grade-school classroom. Leaders controlled the boundaries, decided on what questions to pose, knew all the answers while pretending to depend on the group responses. The class obediently called out the expected answers, with little enthusiasm, as the leader dutifully developed the flip chart laundry list.

Despite the discouraging structure, people often did attempt to talk about what they wanted to, and groups and individuals did, in fact, assert themselves. Some leaders responded by revising their planned curriculum in order to accommodate the spontaneous discussion, but most of the time the leader simply cut it off. ORC observer reports are replete with examples of leaders who appear to be oblivious of the group and the expressed needs of the individuals, and who repeatedly fail to take advantage of the situations that present themselves. The curriculum reigns supreme over the proceedings and is doggedly pursued even when the material is irrelevant to that particular group. Four examples from the site reports will suffice:

> The leader asked the group to contrast what they had expected with what they had actually gotten from their CETA PSE jobs. Overwhelmingly, the participants stated that they had actually gotten more from the PSE jobs than they had expected. The curriculum design apparently assumed that most answers would be negative. The leader continued the exercise as if the opposite response had been true for the group, to everyone's bafflement.
>
> The participants were still employed as PSE employees, awaiting layoffs. Yet, in the entire discussion about what jobs people might look for, not one word was uttered or elicited about what skills they were performing or had learned on the jobs they were currently doing, and how these might be transferred to a targeted search. The curriculum called for another method.
>
> During the morning, Mr. X said that he had an interview scheduled for that afternoon with an employer, and he asked for help in preparing him for it. The leader refused, saying that the curriculum called for "interviewing" in the afternoon session and the program could not be shifted to accommodate him. The person left.
>
> The discussion centered on where people were apt to find jobs. One participant raised the issue of the quality of jobs. She said that too often, available jobs were bad jobs offering nothing for the future and paying poor wages, and they were available mainly because people quit them as soon as they could. Wasn't it important, she asked, to make some inquiries about the upgrading and training opportunities at the place, before a person wasted their time? She was clearly trying to warn the group about the secondary labor market trap she'd been in for so long. The leader treated her contribution with patient forbearance, but failed to recognize the importance of what she was saying because there was no curriculum item dealing with poor jobs. He simply didn't pick up the ball.

Melding curriculum with the emerging concerns of individuals in the group is a difficult problem. Some leaders solve it, but not often and not in many programs. These are two of the examples garnered from the case study reports:

> Leader was quite skillful at keeping a focused curriculum and still responding to issues as they are raised by the group. The entire atmosphere was informal and relaxed, despite the tightness

> of the curriculum and the short time available to deal with important information. When he moved away from subjects which were diversions, he would do so with respect for the group. For example, "This is a fascinating and important discussion, but we have only an hour left to cover how to plan a search. Why don't we pick up the discussion again after the workshop is officially over?
>
> During the morning, a number of people asked about the availability of CETA training slots, which apparently was their main concern. During the lunch break the leaders discussed the afternoon agenda. They decided to drop a skilling exercise because it seemed excessive and inappropriate. Instead, they confronted the CETA slot issue, realizing that unless it was laid to rest, those concerned would not make an active effort.

In summary, the teacher-classroom model for a JST program has many potential disadvantages and traps for the unskilled and uninspired leader. It can create distance between group and leader and reinforce the superior/subordinate role. It may recall earlier life experiences centering on a passive student role. Learning may be impaired by discouraging participation. The classroom model may militate against the development of group cohesiveness and support. It often discourages assertive behavior while expounding the virtues of assertiveness in the job search. If so, it is not apt to address fears, change behavior, or create the atmosphere for psychological impact which are the overt goals of many programs. However, the teacher-classroom model does have the virtue of imparting a great deal of organized information to a number of people in a structured fashion. A leader--or for that matter, a math teacher in high school--who is relaxed, energetic, and imaginative, can overcome most of the negative factors inherent in the model.

The alternative--the workshop model--with its capacity to respond to the issues as they arise, would appear to represent the ideal amalgam of a variety of goals. It provides information that is directly applicable to the concerns of the group and maintains flexibility and sponteneity. Only one of the sites used the workshop model throughout and, in it, most of the problems inherent in the classroom model were overcome. However, it is questionable whether such fully flexible, workshop modes could be replicated in large institutions. To operate such a program successfully requires leaders of uncommon skill in group dynamics who exude relaxed self-confidence as well as a solid foundation of knowledge about occupations, labor markets, and job search techniques. Bureaucracies are not plentifully endowed with individuals as skilled and trained as were the leaders in that one program. Neither are such skills easily imparted through in-service training.

There are also historic experiences with loose formats which serve as a warning. During the 60s the employment and training world witnessed a rash of "therapy" programs administered by less than qualified individuals, and the results were hardly impressive. "Rap" sessions went on endlessly, sometimes enjoyably, but often led nowhere. Unlike other types of therapy and self-help groups, JST is a short, finite program, with limited goals, limited capacity, and a limited intrinsic contract between the person and the program operator.

Nevertheless, any leader's performance can be improved through training. For JST to become and remain an effective social intervention, reasonable and possible goals should be set. However lofty the prevailing rhetoric, it is unreasonable to expect that if only the 'right' leaders and the 'right' method were instituted in a large delivery system, JST could be an effective mechanism for changing the basic personality and outlook of its users. Even with optimum leadership skills and teaching methods, such quick "fixes" are generally ephemeral and shallow. It is reasonable, however, to set a goal for improving JST programs and making them more effective. At the very least, leaders should be disabused of the prevalent notion that their main job is getting through all of the prescribed material as quickly as possible. A silent group that doesn't interrupt should not earn "brownie" points for the leader. Even less effective leaders could be helped if they were provided with built-in exercises or techniques for creating a more relaxed mood and some group sense. At a minimum, participants should introduce themselves to the group and state the kind of jobs they are looking for. This is possible even in the short ES programs.

Leaders need better training and supervision than merely being provided with written materials and seeing someone run one session. They need to observe effective models in operation, they need a period of internship, of try-out, of critiquing, and supervision. And, in the last analysis, some leaders simply should be replaced, for their own sake as well as for the program's. While the goal of having highly trained "therapists" in a mass delivery system is unrealistic, it is equally foolhardy to assume that anyone can run a group, that the job is easy. It isn't and it should not be treated in a cavalier fashion.

The Participants

In all, ORC staff observed approximately 300 individuals participating in JST programs. Three groups had more than 25 participants, while three groups had three or less. More than half of the participants were women, although only one program had only women. Racially, about half of the programs had mixed participants. However, the other half reflected the wide differences in minority distribution of population at selected locations. Thus, they were strongly "ghettoized"--almost all white, or black, or Hispanic. As would be expected, the participants came from all walks of life, all levels of educational attainment, and a wide range of occupations. About half were seeking white collar jobs, the other half were in blue collar, service occupations.

ORC observers were especially interested in the relative degrees of homogeneity and heterogeneity, on any significant dimension. Of the 30 programs, 16 were targeted for particular groups--youth, PSE employees, welfare clients, or professionals changing careers. The other fourteen were available to the full flow of ES job seekers or to any CETA eligibles, regardless of other characteristics. Hence, participants with college degrees sat next to high school dropouts and artists and musicians exchanged experiences with waitresses. The preponderance of participants were in their 20s and 30s, but eighteen-year-olds joined in discussion with middle-aged clients. Most of the heterogeneous programs included some welfare clients, rehabilitation clients, ex-offenders, and other people with special problems. There were relatively few older workers noted.

Of particular interest was the way participants felt about the programs. Many feed-back comments were made to ORC observers during coffee breaks, and in the course of discussion. Most were very positive, except in a few programs where there was clear irritation and anger at being "treated like children." Occasionally, individuals engaged in hostile and angry attacks on the leader. By and large, however, the participants appeared to enjoy the experience and to appreciate the opportunity to attend. In order to check the validity of the observations, an evaluative questionnaire was offered at the completion of the classroom phase at 11 of the sites, to which 84 participants responded. In response to the question, "Do you feel that the program has made you better able to find work?" 59 of the 84 (70 percent) answered, "Yes, much better." Another 25 (30 percent) said, "Yes, somewhat." Asked how the program had met their expectations, 35 respondents (42 percent) indicated that they had gotten more than they had expected, 43 (51 percent) said that they had received about what they expected, and six (7 percent) felt that they had gotten less. In addition, follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with 21 participants from nine of the programs three to six months after their attendance. Of the 21, 19 (90 percent) thought that the program had been useful. Eleven were working at the time of the contact but several more had had short-term jobs in the interim.

The participants felt that the two most valuable aspects of the training were improvements in their interviewing abilities and the boost given their self-confidence.

Comments on Relevant Issues

1. The California EDD survey of participant responses, the survey of participants at visited sites, and the impressions of ORC observers are in agreement. Generally, JSTs are liked and appreciated by users who appear to consider them a useful and helpful social intervention. Participants of programs which ORC felt were dull and uninspired still maintained that they had been helped. Even in very short programs there is evidence that the public appreciates the effort.

2. A serious trade-off question is involved in determining whether groups should be homogeneous on any dimension (age, occupation, welfare status, disability, etc.) or heterogeneous. The positive value of homogeneity is that it is possible to get into more depth about the issue that ties the group, and to tailor the curriculum to suit the problem. Thus, the JST program targeted for professional and managerial career changers was able to devote considerable curriculum time to the subject of transferring skills. The ORC Youth Demonstration--Job Track--tailored the curriculum to the specific problems faced by inexperienced young workers, and employers' prejudices about hiring youth. Ex-offender groups can deal more specifically with the problem of confronting the employer with a conviction record. JST programs for welfare clients might be more effective if they dealt more openly with the trade-offs between staying on welfare versus working for low take-home pay while meeting the cost of working.

   The prevailing feeling in the field, however, especially among those who administered heterogeneous programs, was that the mixed programs were preferable because they provided an unusually enriching experience for the participants with considerable gain from the exchange, even at the cost of depth. ORC observers tended to agree. Youth learn from the adults present, welfare clients were less stigmatized and "ghettoized" and more apt to see themselves as potential workers. ORC observers reported repeated instances of client surprise at the revelation that other people, previously regarded with awe or contempt, actually had similar problems. Often that experience was, in itself, as fear destroying as confronting an employer. Cost savings and better utilization are also factors to be considered in deciding between the two alternatives. Not infrequently, program operators chafed at the homogeneity which was arbitrarily imposed by funding sources and institutional differences and prerogatives.

3. The difficulty of personalizing and individualizing a job search plan from the core of advice offered in a group setting appears to be an endemic problem, not subject to easy solution. Nevertheless, it did appear to ORC staff that opportunities routinely presented themselves to do so without unduly disrupting the proceedings. Often, focusing the attention of the entire group on solving one person's problem is a learning experience for everyone, especially if the problem is fairly common to the group.

Selecting Group Leaders

ORC observers sought to determine who the group leaders were, what training and background they brought to the task, and what criteria appeared to influence their selection.

Despite JST's relatively short history, there seemed to be an extreme degree of turnover in JST leadership, which confounded the research task. Out of some 60 leaders, either observed or interviewed, only 11 had been with the program since its inception, which was seldom more than three years, and some had begun only weeks before the ORC visit. In one employment service site, there had been four different leaders in eight months. A variety of reasons were offered--"burnout," promotion, other jobs, etc. However, those programs that had maintained the same leadership over time were having fewer problems of underutilization and were operating far more smoothly.

Opinions in the field differ widely as to the importance of the leader to program outcomes. The Azrin model and the WIN material state that "anyone" can be trained to lead a group. To others, however, the qualities of the leaders are the critical factor, even beyond the content.

Criteria for selecting JST leaders remains an enigma. Charles Hoffman, the founder of the Self-Directed Placement Corporation, confessed to ORC staff members that the matter of leader selection continued to baffle him, despite his varied experiences. At that point, he was seriously considering the use of actors, or people with any kind of performing background. In his considered judgment, the background and experiences that were least likely to produce the kind of effective leadership required to deliver the high energy Self-Directed Placement model were social workers, counselors, and teachers.

These, however, were precisely the backgrounds of most of the leaders in the JSTs studied. Most had been involved in human services in some capacity. Some form of counseling characterized the background of 35 percent of the leaders, especially with youth, ex-offenders, the handicapped, and mental health patients, but few were vocational counselors. Almost a third were former teachers. Several had experience in personnel work in private industry and in private employment agencies, and two had been clergymen. Within the ES/WIN delivery system, the leaders were administratively classified as counselors, placement interviewers, and UI claims examiners. However, though a few had extensive employment service placement experience in the line operations, many were temporary-intermittent employees whose functions within the agency had not exposed them to labor market intermediation dealing directly with employers.

ORC staff had posed for itself the analytical question: To what degree do the JST modes and processes reflect the background and training of the leaders? Half of all of the programs had one or more leaders who were apparently selected because they had done some form of counseling with troubled "special problem" people. Such a caseload is perceived to be suffering from some disability, maladaptation, or social problem. One may speculate that the tone and quality imparted in a program where the leader sees the participants as problem people will differ from the tone and quality in a program where participants are seen as mainly lacking information and certain specific skills. The essentially dependent and unequal relationship between counselor and counselee, if carried into a JST program, militates against an easy exchange between equals. The contrasting view is encapsulated in the opening remarks of one leader to a group: "There's no difference between you and me. I have a job and you don't--that's all. There's nothing wrong with you."

One-on-one counseling is a very different activity from leadership of JST, not only overtly but also in the basic assumptions made about what people lack or need. The group dynamics of a self-help group differ markedly from the dynamics for which most counselors are trained. If properly adapted, the psychological insights may be of use in JST, but grafting the assumptions of counseling onto job search training may be counter-productive and in conflict with the stated and more limited purpose of moving people into an effective self-directed search.

A teaching background appears to be another strong selection factor. This may account for the preponderance of programs that emulate the classroom model in one or another form, be it lecture, curriculum structure, control of the agenda, homework, or the discussion format, though the quality of delivery may vary as widely as it does within the educational system.

Conspiciously missing from the apparent selection criteria was concern with whether the person knew anything about the subject--the labor market and how people might improve their ability to get a job. Only a small number had been trained in vocational counseling. There were some whose experiences in the private sector, either as personnel officers in private companies or in private employment agencies, would have exposed them to job-getting transactions, but that experience rested heavily on professional and upper white-collar jobs. Even in the ES and in WIN, few of the programs were drawing on the reservoir of knowledge represented by their experienced placement and job development staff. In fact, the involvement of placement staff in JST was regarded as an intrusion upon the self-help goals of the program, according to the Texas WIN study.

Though optimum selection standards are still illusive and may, in fact, never be fully realized, agencies need to work towards establishing some type of minimum standard, or a performance test before a group, before assigning JST leaders. Although not a widespread problem, ORC observers did encounter some programs which can only be characterized as bad. To be forced to sit through such programs was tantamount to punishment, for both observer and participant. Not only was the leader dull or offensive, but even worse, the information given was frequently faulty, misleading, or sparse. If the responsible agency can find no alternative other than the use of their least effective staff, the program should be abandoned. It is fallacious to believe that just anyone can be entrusted with a group and the development of program content. Better alternatives are possible. A well-developed series of film modules covering various aspects of job search, followed by group discussion, would be a more helpful device for the job seeker. At least the information would be accurate. A basic, bottom-line criteria should always prevail: Programs may not always be very helpful, but they must never be hurtful, they must never weaken or depreciate their clients, or misdirect them.

Influences on JST Leaders and Program Developers

ORC staff examined the literature and questioned program operators to determine what wellsprings of inspiration and theory most influenced the shape and tone of the programs, and what the paths of influence were. A number of observations and analytical questions generated this probe. Cross-fertilization between programs and changes in original models was clearly occurring. In the initial search for programs, ORC staff had obtained a number of curriculum and program packages. For example, one package sent by a CETA prime had been sold as a JST program, but it was, in fact, a Management by Objectives training package. It was as if the vendor had inadvertently opened the wrong file drawer--Management instead of Manpower--which was now being pumped into puzzled job seekers. Another package arrived which was characterized by a zealous religious orientation. There were programs administered by individuals using the techniques of the est movement, others committed to language manipulation, and any number of other disciplines and gimmicks. The content and shape of programs had been deeply affected by the popularity of the commercial "How To" literature.

What was the process of change? What was the relative influence of labor market oriented sources, as compared with "outside" disciplines? To what degree had the field been invaded by "faddism," unknowledgeable gimmicks, and personal proselytizers? Respondents were asked to recall all the sources of influence on their program design and substance, which were then aggregated by ORC into four basic categories, by major institutions (Table 1).

A number of observations can be made from this table:

1. The influence of the commercial literature very often affects the content and orientation of a program. Bolles' "skilling" methods (Bolles, 1981), and the "No, no, no, no, no, no, yes" construct

taken from Tom Jackson (Jackson, 1978), were evident in a number of visited sites.

2. Though ES staff appears to read the commercial literature, very few have visited other programs.

3. Materials and handouts prepared by the Department of Labor and Employment Service were used only in ES programs (except for one CETA program). Apparently the materials have not been disseminated. It may be that institutions make no effort to inform the field of their availability, or other programs may reject them. This is particularly surprising in WIN, since it sits within the ES system. The only cross-institutional use of written material originating with the formal institutions was the St. James handout on stress questions. Yet, in reviewing all program literature, including that which was developed by the educational system, ORC analysts found that the documents produced by the Department of Labor or the state employment services for either public distribution or for staff training contained some of the most substantial, sophisticated, and knowledgeable job search information available, even though much of it lacked imagination in presentation. For example, the training guide for unemployment insurance interviewers instructing them on the administration of the Seek Work provisions of the law in California would provide JST leaders with an excellent basic approach to the widely different methods used by job seekers in a variety of occupational groupings.

4. Psychologists and others from outside the established employment and training institutions dominate the field, which again raises questions about the relative inertia of the public institutions to which this terrain is mandated. It appears that once a program or document is in place, no further development efforts occur. WIN program operators, in particular, appear disinclined to enrich their perceptions with forays into the literature or with observations of other programs. Yet, the very test of reality appears to have altered the original design. Both ORC field staff and the Texas evaluators found that observed WIN Job Clubs have departed markedly from the techniques demanded by the Azrin model. For example, ORC staff saw no evidence of a "buddy system" operating anywhere, letters to the homes of participants have been largely dropped, the rules for group leaders in regards to lecture time and the rotational method have been bent, and letters to employers are not assiduously pursued. Each of these techniques is required by the Azrin manual. Inevitably, the process of institutionalizing a concept alters it, and the mandated gives way to the possible.

TABLE 1. Influences on JST Programs

		Programs	
	ES	WIN/WEL	CETA
Institutional Influences			
EDD training-Toni St. James Demonstration*	6		
DOL or State ES written materials	10		
Visit to EDD programs			1
Job Factory			1
Received training		2	
Visited site			2
Psychological Influences			
Sales psychology--Self-Directed Placement and others		2	5
Received training		2	2
Visited site			6
Articles, Moyers tape	1	1	1
Behavioral psychology (Azrin)		5	1
Rational Behavior Tyerapy (Ellis/Glaser)			1
Humanistic Psychology (Rogers/Maslow)			4
Educational Influences			
Career education literature	1		3
Dr. Robert Wegmann, training and writings		1	1
Commercial Literature			
Bolles/Crystal, "What Color is Your Parachute" and others	5		5
Attended training seminar by Bolles			1
Jackson, "Guerrilla Tactics in the Job Market"	3		2
Other books	2		1

*Toni St. James was employed by EDD and strongly influenced programs by providing inspirational demonstrations, which were extended into other states. Her "Sixteen Stress Questicns and Suggested Answers" appear in programs across the country.

Conclusions

The environment within which JST occurs and the methods used vary widely--too widely. While JST has every appearance of being a powerful tool for labor market intervention, it needs direction, staff training, standards, supervision, and experimentation to fulfill its full potential. In particular, confusion reigns and needs to be resolved around at least three issues.

Uses of the Group

Besides the cost advantages to be realized, there are potential important values to grouping people for job-search training. It might be well to review briefly the possible uses that can be made of the group format:

1. Groups as a source of social support. Initially, it is helpful to job seekers to see that others are "in the same boat." Then, exchange of experiences, discussion of the kinds of jobs sought, sharing the frustrations of rejection, venting feelings, drinking coffee together--all reduce anxiety and unemployment "blues," enhance the sense of commonality and social support, and act against discouragement. Too many of the observed programs, particularly in ES, did not allow or encourage any sense of social support.

2. Groups as a source of leads--networks. People gain a sense of importance, potency, and usefulness vital to an unemployed individual when they can be of real help to someone else. Even in the two-day ORC youth demonstration project, the young participants posted leads on the board and actually got jobs for others. Unless the participants hear and are encouraged to remember what the other group members are looking for, this does not take place. Sharing leads, ideas, names, etc. seems to have been ignored or abandoned by many programs.

3. Groups as an aid in running the program. Members of the group can be useful and helpful to the leader in a variety of ways. They can share in the practice and rehearsal of interviewing. They can run the video machine, assist in preparing the handout folders, assist in the coffee process, in setting up tables, in cleaning up, in running errands, thus reducing the need for additional staff. To the degree that they are asked to participate in the process, they become part of it and the distance between leader and group is reduced.

4. Groups as a motivational tool. If a group sense is fostered, it often generates motivation to actively search for work. A competitive sense sometimes develops about who will get a job first, especially when the leader creates a method for honoring the accomplishment. Feedback, bolstering, seeing improvement in others--all operate to catapult the

individual out of inertia and fear, toward action.

Those programs that choose to place all power in the leader, that create great distance between leader and group, and that rigidly adhere to curriculum at the cost of making full use of the group have made a costly trade-off.

Mixed Messages

The inconsistency between the verbally expressed injunctions, teaching, and training goals and the hidden messages imparted by the methods used was often startling:

WHAT IS SAID	HIDDEN MESSAGE OF APPROACH
Be assertive Help yourself	Don't talk, be passive, listen and do what we say, be subordinate.
Emphasize the positive when talking to an employer	No structure for positive feedback.
Gain control of the interview	Rehearse scripts or packages entirely prepared by professional staff.
We want to help in every way	We'll tell you what to do, but we won't allow any placement help for you.
Have self confidence	Be obedient, passive, subordinate. Invite negative criticism.
Be independent	"Boss/employee" relationship with rules and threats.
Help each other	Look only to staff professionals No structure provided for mutual help.
Feel good about yourself and your potential	Distance between leader and group. Group treated like children in classroom.

Certainly, participation in a structured group requires that, to a degree, individuals subordinate their personal concerns to those of the group. Inevitably, time limits require that the leader keep a measure of control. Without question, when people are being paid from public moneys, some kind of supervision and time accountability are appropriate, and expectations need to be explicit. However, the mixed messages noted above spring from extreme examples of conflict and inconsistency. JST leaders and their clients would all benefit from becoming aware of the problem and striving for more consistency between what is said, what is taught, and what is actually done.

Goal Confusion--What Is Meant by Self-Help?

The basic purpose of JST is to train people to act as their own brokers in the labor market. Certain objective realities prompt this development:

1. Joblessness is costly to the individual and to society.
2. Large numbers of individuals are ineffective as job seekers. This is particularly true of poor people.
3. Poor people can't afford to buy job-getting services. Professionals, executives, even employers, often do choose to buy a broker service. They pay sizable fees to executive search firms, private employment agencies, and other private sector institutions to perform the brokering function for them. They do so because they don't know the field, can't do it well, or don't choose to spend their time and efforts in that activity. That option isn't available to poor people, as a rule, not only because of the costs, but because less skilled individuals are not desirable clients.
4. Public institutions that offer the service free of charge have increasingly fewer resources available to provide most job seekers with professional brokering or advocacy assistance.

In the light of those realities, when a public institutiuon says "Help yourself," it is essentially saying, "We can't do it for you." A welfare mother with small children who already copes with innumerable problems does not gain in virtue if she finds her own job. Neither does an engineer lose virtue if he pays someone to do it for him. The difference between them is that she doesn't have his option, and therefore, she _must_ help herself by finding her own job. There is no one else to do it for her.

What, then, should an agency contribute to the JST process? What are the obligations of the service providers? A range of concepts surround the self-help rubric. A JST program in an employment service office, for instance, says it is providing "self-help" and yet retains the entire broker role, withholding information about any job-getting methods other than ES, even though the agency in that community captures only 5 to 6 percent of the job transactions. "Self-help" in that program really means, "Do it well when we send you out on an interview." What are the ethics of such a stance? Hasn't the agency an obligation to inform the participants of the limitations of its own capacity and to teach other ways to get jobs?

The other end of the "self-help" mythology spectrum appears in the Azrin model of the WIN Job Clubs where the self-help rhetoric is so operative that any help offered by the placement staff or even the act of allowing clients to examine the Job Bank is frowned upon as a violation of the basic "self-help" tenet under which they operate. Every other job seeker may look to the Job Bank for help, including the teenager. Yet practical help for the welfare mother with many more strikes against her is frowned upon. Is that welfare mother really better off because she has to work harder to get a job? Is working harder to get a job intrinsically "good" for her, or is it actually punitive?

What is the goal? Is it to provide "therapy," or is it to help people get jobs? Is it to effect major changes in the values and personalities of users, or is it to increase their effectiveness as job seekers?

In ORC's view, self-help shouldn't be used as an institutional "cop-out." It doesn't absolve the agency from offering whatever it has to offer. "Self-help" is an institutional plea, an admission: "We can't do it all. We don't command an adequate reservoir of human resources. You must contribute to that reservoir by doing some of the work yourself." The contract between the institution and the individual should be a partnership, a promise that each will do everything feasible to get the task accomplished. For the job seeker, the stakes are far too high. Manipulative, withholding games, in the name of "self-help," are inappropriate and arrogant. However limited its resources, the agency is obligated to make them available to the job seeking public, even those who participate in JST programs.

Chapter IV

PREPARATION FOR THE SEARCH

Common to all JST programs is a curriculum, a body of substantive information and advice which presumes to inform and prepare participants to pursue the most effective way to become employed. Most reports and evaluations of JSTs focus on the motivational, operational, and outcome aspects, but little evaluative information or critical dialogue has emerged about the substance--what, precisely, are people being taught about getting a job for themselves? What is the source of that knowledge? Do people come away with a realistic "game plan?" Do and can they confront the labor market more effectively as a result of their participation? Is there concensus in the core of advice offered? The following observations from initial site visits illustrate the question:

1. There is widespread similarity of subject matter. For instance, almost every program has something to say about the interview and the application. Yet wide differences were noted in what precisely was said about these subjects. A few examples will suffice:

   Program A teaches that the important thing to do in interviewing for a job is to "gain control of the interview." Program B, with equal vehemence, addressing essentially the same kind of individuals, teaches that the most negative impression a job seeker can make is to "take over an interview" and waste the interviewer's time.

   Youth Program A spends most of its classroom time teaching its clients all of the intricacies of writing different types of resumes because it considers the resume the single most important job getting tool for a youth. Youth Program B regards the resume as a waste of time for inexperienced workers and does not incorporate it in the curriculum.

   Program A tells its CETA eligible clients in a medium sized city that going directly to the employer's establishment is the "worst way to look for a job," while Program B, with the same type of clientele in a similar labor market, declares that the single best way to get a job is to "hit the bricks," to go directly to the employer's place of business.

   Although these injunctions are diametrically opposite, no external or objective reasons for the differences were apparent.

2. Generally, the advice is offered with great authority and certainty. Programs committed to a single "best" method, such as the supervised telephoning technique, or rooted in a particular psychological school, serve their own purposes by generally disparaging all methods save their own. A good deal of the information and advice offered was permeated

with the particular personal views, images, class orientations, backgrounds, and biases of program designers and operators. Few of these injunctions appeared to be either grounded in labor market research findings or their own wide personal experience with the labor exchange function.

3. Despite the dissimilarity of advice, the same materials and exercises appeared in many JST programs across the country and across institutional lines, passing from program to program, often without identification of authorship or source. The material was used because it often was the only material available. Its relevance to a particular target group or a particular labor market was generally not a consideration.

4. ORC observers often noted a marked discrepancy between the advice offered and the job barriers and personal problems enunciated by the participants present. Rigid adherence to program curriculum too often missed the mark entirely, and appeared irrelevant to the concerns of the group. Welfare mothers with limited skills and work experience expressed concern that the low wages they could command in the labor market, coupled with the loss of all welfare benefits, would actually leave them in reduced circumstances. Yet, in some programs they were exhorted to engage in "I am proud. . ." exercises, or were taught the difference between a functional or chronological resume, while the real barrier, the actual cause of their apparent lack of enthusiasm and motivation remained unaddressed.

These initial observations convinced ORC staff that, no matter how difficult and elusive the task, the most useful contribution it could make to the state of the art would be to analyze the content, the substantive advice and information offered in JST. However varied the models, the analysis would focus on the one common denominator: all JST programs teach a body of information about how to look for work. The analytic questions include: From program to program, how similar or different are the teachings? Is there room for improvement? To what degree does that which is taught represent the most authoritative body of knowledge available about the labor market?

ORC observers approached the task with the following viewpoints:

- People in different occupations and different labor markets find jobs in a variety of ways. No single technique is foolproof or offers a guarantee. The opening and filling of a job is a chaotic, volatile process. Effective search is enhanced by familiarity and ease with multiple methods and a wide knowledge base.

- Because of time constraints, all JST programs would not be able to incorporate all possible aspects of job search in their curriculums. However, a leader who possesses a body of knowledge beyond the curriculum limits is far better equipped to serve a disparate (and often desperate) group of individuals who often ask questions and raise issues that go beyond the limitations of selected curriculum subjects.

- Placement success does not, by itself, prove the validity of the information and advice given and the truism, "You can't argue with success," begs the validity question. The success statistics attributed to JST programs do not speak to the cause/effect relationship between the substance taught and the final outcomes. Also, success is not uniformly high in all programs, and concern should extend to those who do not succeed through JST intervention. Little is known about which elements in a program are more or less responsible for relative success, and it may never be possible to isolate and test the subtler variables of such a complex intervention. A program could be teaching nonsense, but the mere act of grouping people with similar problems and paying them to persist in an activity could produce respectable outcome statistics. For example, the astonishing success rate of one of the youth programs visited might be attributable to a great number of very exciting and unique features that surround and underpin it, but it would be foolhardy in the extreme to use the success rate as a validation of the mediocre content and uninspired delivery of the classroom activity.

Despite the caution of the observers in attempting to capture all significant content items, it is possible that some of the teaching elements escaped attention. In such a vast array of material, some slippage is inevitable. However, it is the considered view of the observers that the core of advice in all of the programs studied is essentially captured and synthesized in the ensuing analysis.

Criteria for Evaluation

ORC observers adopted a more evaluative stance towards the content analysis than they did toward other dimensions of JST. In order to do that, they sought to identify criteria which were acknowledged as expert and objective, against which the JST teaching could be compared. The criteria used in this analysis requires a brief rationale:

It can be said that all JST programs are an attempt to "professionalize" the population, to convey at least some of the knowledge and skills that the professional labor market broker acquires and uses daily in acting both as the employer's agent when appraising the applicant, and as a job seeker's advocate when selling the applicant to the employer. When JST programs teach participants how to talk on the telephone, how to uncover unlisted job openings, how to "package" themselves, how to bring out their best points, they are, in essence, teaching participants to substitute their own efforts for the professional advocacy role. When JST programs teach people what may be offensive or positive on an application or in an interview, they are essentially imparting the knowledge used by the professional labor market broker in the role of employer's agent. The behavior of the job applicant that would most deter the broker from making the referral is, in most cases, precisely the same behavior that would cause the employer to reject the applicant.

Hence, the expertise of the professional interviewer or counselor acting in the broker role is one relevant measure which can be applied in evaluating the validity of JST teachings about particular aspects of the job search process.

Two mechanisms--the public employment service and the private employment agency industry--embody a large pool of this expertise in labor market intermediation and their materials were used as comparative measures. The public employment service has, for over 50 years, developed and used a core of techniques involved in labor market brokering across the full occupational spectrum. It has assembled a broad base of knowledge and objective standards for the purpose of administering the work test for unemployment insurance claimants which determines the adequacy of their search for work. That knowledge and expertise is contained in the various training documents used to develop and retain a high standard of professionalism in the tasks used by its staff in matching the worker to the job. Evaluation criteria were drawn from the following ES documents: Instructor's guides and reading units addressed to the assessment and completion interviewers, the placement interviewer, and the employment counselor; the training guide for use of the Directory of Occupational Titles; the reading unit used to train interviewers to review the adequacy of seek-work efforts of unemployment insurance claimants, and training material for taking job orders. These documents represent a broad array of technical knowledge and skills required of a labor market broker or intermediary within the ES.

Although the visions and activities of most private employment agencies are limited to serving white-collar occupations, ORC staff analyzed various documents used by the private employment agency industry to train its professional staff.* It was a surprising revelation that a considerable portion of the training was almost identical to that offered in ES. While it is true that the roles and goals of the interviewer in the public employment service, the "counselor" in the private employment agency, and the individual job seeker are very different in many respects, there is one area of congruence: the job performed daily by the labor market brokers in both the employment service and the private employment agency industry includes many of the same tasks that job seekers must learn to perform if they are to function on their own behalf.

---

*Proprietory interests prohibit references to titles and companies.

The theoretical, empirical, and commercial literature, which is reviewed in a separate volume of this study (Mangum, 1981), also formed a basis for comparison with the contents of JST programs. Research findings about labor market behavior were explored to determine whether JST teaching contradicted or ignored important insights which would be valuable to job seekers.

Finally, the project director drew on her 17 years dealing directly with job seekers and employers of all occupations, 11 years in labor market research, which included national studies of help wanted ads and of the employment service, and three years as a public member of the Advisory Board to the Bureau of Employment Agencies in California, the regulatory body for the private employment agency industry. This represents considerable exposure to labor market transactions and intermediary roles, validating the role of "expert."

Data Base

Matrices were developed representing critical dimensions of the job search process. The following documents were analyzed into matrix format: ORC case study reports of visited sites; printed curriculum and handouts from visited sites; curriculum and handout material from non-visited programs; WIN curriculum in the proposed Technical Assistance Guide; the Workshop Leaders' handbook issued by the California EDD; the Azrin Manual; and other seminal works, including Department of Labor printed pamphlets, state ES documents, and commercial packages used in non-visited sites.

The structure of JST programs and the logic in which the material was imbedded varied so widely, it became necessary for ORC to devise its own categories and superimpose them on the material. Hence, similar types of information were taken out of the format used, synthesized and categorized under the ORC structure. Particular attention was paid to the fact that though many programs included a common item, the amount of time and emphasis devoted to it varied widely among programs. Where possible, the percent of classroom time devoted to a category is used as an indicator of the relative importance attached to it. This excludes supervised search time, and is limited to the classroom setting. Unless otherwise noted, the examples given refer only to the visited sites.

Conceptually, the substantive categories for the analysis were grouped in a sequence that might be logically pursued by the job seeker, beginning with decisions to be made before the search begins and extending to post-interview behavior. Again, this order is imposed on the material, since each program applies its own logical sequence.

The presentation of what is taught and done in JST programs is divided into two principal parts. The first, constituting the remainder of this chapter, covers preparation and orientation for the job search. It contains two subdivisions: (1) Pre-search knowledge and decisions. This includes concepts about the labor market and its operations, and it deals with decisions about what kind of work to pursue, and (2) Approaching the search, which is concerned with planning and preparing for the search. The second part, consisting of the job search proper, is the substance of the next chapter.

Pre-Search Knowledge and Decisions

The dimensions that are most commonly dealt with under this category can be framed as two simple questions: What is the nature of the playing field--the labor market? What kind of work should you look for?

Labor Market Concepts and Information

All JST programs are inherently imparting some vision of the labor market, whether they do so as a curriculum item, or whether it emerges in the course of justifying recommended participant behavior. In fact, approximately 60 percent of the JST programs visited used about 10 percent of their classroom time to provide formalized labor market orientation or information.

It is unfortunate that the term "labor market information" evokes an image, especially with government agency staff, of that type of aggregate data that are regularly collected and produced by labor market analysts, either for a particular SMSA or nationally. Generally, the data provide quantitative information about employment and unemployment and industrial and occupational trends. Reports flow regularly to ES local offices, on to interviewers' desks, and into waste paper baskets. They are of notoriously little value to interviewers who act on behalf of job seekers. As a result, ORC analysts encountered considerable aversion when program leaders and operators were questioned about the use of "labor market information."

Nevertheless, JSTs operate in the context of labor markets and their institutuions. Labor market information, in fact, incorporates a much wider range of dimensions which are potentially useful to job seekers than the term has come to imply. Labor economists generally teach that accurate information is a valuable commodity and that job search success is positively correlated with knowledge of the labor market. If that is so, then a JST program that provides little information or (worse) inaccurate perspectives about the labor market cannot be regarded as an exemplary model, even though its efforts are directed to improving morale, self-image, or techniques.

ORC analysts searched the content of the JST programs and program materials for three types of labor market focus:

1. A broad vision or concept about the job market and how it operates.
2. Information about the structure and behavior of labor markets and labor market institutions. This information maps the terrain for job seekers and serves to inform their decisions about what kind of institutions are appropriate to use, and what to anticipate in the hiring and upgrading processes.
3. Intensive information about the local market, its institutions and employers, and their idiosyncrasies, conditions, and practices.

Broad Labor Market Concepts. The theoretical concept most often referred to in JST programs is the "hidden market." Basically, the hidden market, as used, defines job openings that are uncovered through one's own efforts, as distinct from job openings formally listed with labor market intermediaries.

This concept is probably derived from the numerous research studies about how people get work, which inevitably find that the majority do so through the use of informal mechanisms such as networks of friends and relatives and by contacting employers directly without referral from any source (Mangum, 1981). Most studies find that this varies significantly by occupation and industry, by age, race, and even location. As can be anticipated, the percentage of individuals who get work through informal networks is significantly lower in poverty populations, since their networks are less apt to produce access to jobs.

The "hidden market" sobriquet was applied by a well-known commercial writer in the field and is now widely used (Jackson & Mayleas, 1976). Haldane Associates, the world's largest career management service, uses "hidden market" in its advertising, asserting that 75 percent of the highest-paid administrative, professional, and executive positions are not advertised or listed. However, as with the term "secondary market," its meaning is diffuse and imprecise. JST operators offer a bewildering range of percentages--75 to 95--which are supposed to describe (1) the portion of job finders who obtained jobs which had never been advertised, or (2) the size of the "hidden market" on any given day. "Hidden market" is also used to describe the process of "creating your own job." In actual fact, a synthesis of eight studies conducted since 1968 about how people found work indicates that approximately 58 percent did so through friends and relatives, direct contact with employers and other informal means (Mangum, 1981, pp. 21-35). ORC staff were unable to identify any information source which defines the size of the "hidden market" or even the size of the open market at any given moment. Nevertheless, the term appears to have strong operational value and conceptual impact.

The "hidden market" construct offers a rationale for the "boiler room" telephoning strategy adopted by many JST programs, using mainly the yellow pages of the phone book. Small and large employers are contacted who might have an opening or might be considering a new hire, in order to capture the job presumably before it has an opportunity to filter into the public arena. In a peculiar twist of logic that speaks to the misinformation sometimes found in the field, one program offered by a private contractor discusses the "hidden market" as a concept, and then proceeds to offer the help wanted ads--the least hidden of markets--as the main telephone targets in supervised search.

The high rate of turnover is another broad vision of labor market behavior which is often imparted in JST programs. The purpose for introducing the turnover construct is to reassure participants that "there are always jobs out there, even in a recession." However, the turnover information is poorly understood and often misused. There is no discussion about high-turnover industries or occupations as an indicator of job quality, working conditions, or job accessibility. An example of confusion about turnover was evident in one particular site where the leader stated reassuringly, "Our goal here is that you get a good stable job, not just any job." However, when preparing the group for the telephoning process, the same leader stated, "Our methods here are designed to give you access to those high-turnover jobs we discussed." The leader appeared oblivious to the discrepancy between the two statements.

In fact, though high-turnover occupations are not necessarily "poor" jobs (longshoremen, construction workers, etc.), high turnover is one important dimension of the secondary labor market because it is often caused by low status and low wages. Such jobs are more easily obtained and as quickly abandoned. "Good" jobs generally take longer to get because they are either in protected markets or become available at the ports of entry into internal markets. Characteristically, obtaining such jobs requires a deliberate choice, and above all, persistence of effort. Again, the issue relates to the apparent conflict between program goals and the strategies being taught. ORC observers were unable to find any program that recognized the fact that job search strategies would be quite different, depending on the stability and desirability of the work being pursued. "Good" jobs were distinguished from "bad" jobs in terms of personal values and tradeoffs, but not in relation to the relative complexities of finding them and the different strategies required.

A competitive view of the market is sometimes put forth as a motivational impetus for intensity of search. It is argued that there are more people than jobs in most occupations. The competition becomes more intense and selection factors become more rigid and demanding when the job is more widely publicized. Hence, the competition can best be "beat out" if the opening is unearthed prior to its public announcement. Employers tend to raise their specifications as they cope with large numbers of job applicants.

The widest divergence of views was found in the varying perceptions about what happens at the hiring point and how employers behave. One view, frequently found in the field, regards the employer's decision to hire as intrinsically rational, based on the desire to make profits, to keep down the costs of hiring and training, to reduce risk factors, to reduce turnover. However, a theoretical principle put forth by most influential programs teaches that the employer's decision to hire is primarily non-rational, dependent almost solely on the subtle personal interaction between the hiring agent and the job applicant, and therefore, infinitely malleable, given the right "sales" approach. The secret of success is "make them like you." All manner of statistics are cited* to substantiate the contention that by far the most powerful elements in the hiring decision are the personality and communication skills of the job applicant, no matter what the occupation.

Both "rationalists" and "non-rationalists" offer the same basic core of advice--present yourself well to the employer. However, there are important differences in what precisely is meant by "well," and what specific elements about a person would serve most to impress or discourage an employer. The rationalists are much more concerned, for example, with eliciting work-related skills, with overcoming problems associated with work history such as job hopping, gaps in chronology, recent extended and unexplained unemployment, bad references, firings. To the rationalists with a strong labor market orientation, these are the indicators to the employer of high risk. They may suggest inability to do the work, inability to get along with others, absenteeism, obscured problems such as having been in jail or a mental hospital, or lack of serious attachment to work. On the one hand, the non-rationalists are much more inclined to focus on the "sales" issues--"reading the office" to find the basis for small talk during the interview; "packaging" yourself as with an attractive resume, and follow-up thank-you letters on colored stationery. Of course, two viewpoints have areas in common. Both would be concerned with a neat and complete application, good appearance, not speaking ill of former employers, displaying good manners, and other common-sense advice. But the difference in emphasis make for very different messages.

---

*The proposed WIN technical assistance guide refers to a survey of 200 employers who maintain that only 10 percent of their decision is based on experience or job skills. It would be interesting to know the occupational spectrum included in the survey.

There are subtler content implications that stem from how program developers and leaders view the labor market and how they see their clients in relation to it. An underlying philosophy that basically sees the client's problems as a consequence of social and systemic "pathologies" is apt to express a stance along the following lines: "Mobilize your own resources and pit them against victimization. Learn the game as it is actually played out there. Our collective task in this program is to remove the extra barriers that are created because you may lack the knowledge and skills needed to manipulate an essentially cold, indifferent, and often unjust, amoral structure. Its punishment and reward systems are impersonal, systemic, and do not define your personal worth." With such an approach there would be a concerted effort to explain "out there" as much as possible.

At the other extreme is a frequently encountered view which perceives the 'pathology' as a personal one--that the client is culpable, the primary generating source of the employment problem.* The implications are that the social and economic institutions are essentially just and rational, meting out rewards for boldness and aggressiveness, and punishment for reticence and timidity. Helping means changing individuals to fit the reward standards. The approach that emerges from such a stance is basically evangelical, uplifting, and directed at the whole person: "You can be and do anything you want, you can control your own life (or the interview), you are empowered, you and you alone are responsible for everything that happens to you. We believe in you and will help you attain your highest goals." This view would tend to concentrate its efforts on the individual, changing the person's self-image and behavior with far less focus on providing practical information about the labor market. Though essentially positive and humanistic, the difficulty with this message is the second edge of the sword. Success proves worthiness, but failure can only be equated with personal worthlessness, a self-assessment that is already in oversupply among JST participants.

---

*Susan Sontag has discussed analogous conjectures prevalent in the country that cancer was essentially self-willed and self-generating. She compared it to the history of tuberculosis. When the cause of the disease was identified, and the appropriate curing agent was found, such conjectures became irrelevant. Sontag, Susan. Illness As A Metaphor. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978.

An example of this type of message can be seen in one youth program that put forth such underlying disdain for "lousy" youth market work that one could only wonder at the middle-class tunnel vision that pervaded the otherwise commendable attempt to motivate the young people. Some participants had yet to work for anyone, and a job obtained and retained for three months at McDonalds might represent a major accomplishment. Yet such experiences were being methodically downgraded. Generally, people start their work life in the poor youth market jobs, from which most individuals learn something about working and subsequently leave. Too often, in the effort to raise the goals of the participants, leaders who are generally of the professional class themselves tend to impose their own values, and the result is the exact reverse of the intent--the self-image is lowered, not raised--because the work the participant has done or is apt to do is downgraded and demeaned.

A personal experience will clarify the point. In a JST workshop conducted by this writer with a group of severely disadvantaged black men in 1965, one of the men stated that he was looking for a janitorial job, for which he had completed a six-week MDTA training course. In the course of the evening, in a burst of motivational "hype," I reproved the group for setting such consistently low goals. The young man, awkwardly and with more kindness than I deserved, defended the occupation, declaring that there was a lot more to being a good janitor than I might be aware of, that he had learned how to strip a floor, how to operate different kinds of equipment, and did I know that a person could permanently ruin a good floor by not knowing what kinds of material to use? It was a sobering and humbling lesson--to accept and dignify where people are as a reality, and to recognize the arrogance and contempt that is inherent in what sometimes passes as "motivating" people.

The question of which approach is more effective is really arguable. The issue comes to this: Is the immediate lift, the "hype," enough to propel individuals into actions which result in some measure of immediate success, which then creates its own dynamics of behavioral change? Or is it possible that a greater understanding of that outside system, its structure, its institutions, how and why it operates, how it is organized, and where its back doors are apt to be, actually serves to relieve the onus of personal worthlessness, and to enable the individual to take realistic steps toward getting "a piece of the action?" The issue is posed in dichotomous terms for the sake of clarity. There is no inherent reason why the two approaches are irreconcilable. People do need to be moved, they do need to tap in on their own resources. They also need to understand the real world if they are to function well in it. Nonetheless, the two directions emerge as dichotomous in the analysis of the programs and the program materials.

In sum, ORC observers found that broad visions of the labor market in JST programs were limited to the "hidden market" construct, poorly understood and inaccurate information about high turnover as a market phenomena, disputed and questionable perceptions about employer behavior, and a competitive view of the labor market. Also, different perceptions about the degree to which the individual or the market place is to be held culpable for unemployment significantly affects the content emphasis in JST programs.

Labor Market Mapping. Labor market participants face a complex range of choices involving the relative value of jobs and ways of obtaining them. Rational choice requires institutional and structural information to forewarn or instruct the job seeker about employment practices of different kinds of institutions and variations in recruitment and hiring environments. Examples are the relative advantage of working for small, medium, and large employers; the paths that lead out of the secondary market entrapment in various fields; prevailing practices in hiring and upgrading in different occupations and industries; the trade-offs between starting wage, fringe benefits, and chances for upgrading; back doors into job preserves (e.g., "helpers" jobs into apprenticeships, clerical into professional, temporary or part-time into permanent); long-range civil service strategies; and other types of such mapping information which might facilitate and inform the decisions and the behavior of the participants. Only in JST programs conducted by employment service staff was any such information forthcoming. Most other JST programs were devoid of such focus.

Intensive Local Job Information. Only one program had a curriculum item on this subject. However, such knowledge is often effectively provided in other formats: (1) By the leader and the group in their collective efforts to assist each other with job leads or with general information about the local market in particular occupations. A number of programs maintain a job board on which leads are posted and shared. (2) By the use of materials, tools, printouts, employer directories, demand lists, access to job-bank openings, access to inactive job orders, and other types of paraphernalia, designed to provide participants with information about the local market, ranging from transportation maps to actual openings. (3) By local employers addressing the group or participating in role playing as was done in six programs, all run by ES staff.

In this arena, no other program even touches some ES programs in either volume or appropriateness of the material. This is understandable since ES staff or former staff are more likely to be aware of the sources and constructs of this type of information. For example, in two ES programs, participants had access to inactive job orders. A job order contains the most useful, the most intensive type of written information available about jobs and employers. It describes the type of people they hire, both occupationally and preferentially, the person to ask for, the location, and transportation, working conditions, level of wages, and type of firm. Though participants are warned that the order does not indicate a current opening, the job orders prove most helpful to people in targeting their search.

One ES youth program in a community where public transportation is a severe problem utilized the special resources of the agency in an innovative way. Participants were provided with computer printouts listing all employers in the SMSA, either by zip code, by size of firm, and/or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code. Armed with industry/occupational matrixes, the DOT, the SIC book, inactive orders, want ads, and yellow pages, 18-year-olds "researched" the material and made decisions about whom to phone and where to go, based on the availability of transportation to them, and their preference in regard to size and type of firm. The observer was startled at the ease and pleasure with which these young people grasped and pursued the research task, once the principle and process were made clear. Perhaps they learned as much about research as they did about getting jobs.

At one ES site, staff had prepared an audiovisual presentation about firms and occupations in the local labor market, using successful former workshop participants as models. At another ES site, where JST workshops had been operating for a number of years, the program had developed what is probably the most extensive labor market library seen anywhere in the country. It contains nearly every kind of career-choice aid, including all of the available occupational materials, published both commercially and by the Department of Labor. It also contained numerous other materials, including an inactive order file. The scope of information available about various dimensions of the local labor market and the search for work would satisfy every reasonable need of a word-oriented job seeker. Because this program is targeted for professionals seeking to change occupations, the library is in active use. Library materials are available in other programs, but there is less evidence of use, since the targeted populations are generally less inclined toward a self-directed tangle with written material, unless specifically taught how to do so.

Conclusions. An analysis of the amount and quality of labor market information imparted to JST participants leads to the following perceptions:

1. Overall, labor market knowledge in all the dimensions discussed is seriously inadequate in most programs. ORC observers found during interviews that leaders are generally undereducated and unknowledgeable about the subject they are teaching.

2. The employment service as a labor market institution is understandably better equipped in this respect than are other public or private deliverers of JST. Its exposure to the labor force is more catholic and ubiquitous, and its orientation is inherently more reflective of the market intermediation role. Nevertheless, even the ES has not plumbed the richness of information that is inherent in its own written material, that lies in the heads of its experienced interviewers, that exists in research findings and theoretical constructs.

3. Far more information about the local market is currently being gathered, analyzed, and researched under the auspices of the labor market information program, and made available to all but the most rural labor markets, than is being disseminated through most JST programs. The format in which the information is organized and presented is not designed for such dissemination. Translating such esoteric information into usable and understandable form is beyond the ability of most workshop leaders. Whether for use in its own programs, or as a service to the field in general, the development of such material is basically the responsibility of ES, the agency best equipped for that role.

4. The theoretical literature is permeated with many insights and constructs that could usefully be converted into practitioners' terms so that they could bring more substance and depth to what they teach to clients. In the process of designing its San Francisco youth demonstration project, ORC staff asked Garth Mangum to test a syllabus by presenting to a group of EDD workshop leaders in the San Francisco

Bay Area an economist's review of practical applications of the prevailing theories about various labor market dimensions. A number of participants subsequently expressed their gratitude for the "mind-stretching" day, indicating that this type of knowledge is invaluable in running workshops. The main value of the presentation was that no matter how theoretical the material, it was conceptualized in "what's in it for me" terms--exactly how the construct or knowledge could be used in a workshop.

It does appear that the often esoteric formulations of economists, usually intended only for each other's eyes and ears, are translatable to ordinary people when it concerns their own work lives. Surely the material presented to the EDD group could be refined, sharpened, and related to practical use in conducting groups.

5. The present state of research into the efficiency and effectiveness of various job search methods is insufficient. Virtually nothing is known about the duration of unemployment associated with alternative search methods. The research literature has little to offer that identifies differences in the hiring environments, selection devices, and hiring decisions by occupation levels, industries, or size of firms. Hence the image imparted by JST programs is always the same--a desk interview, a work application, a resume. It is doubtful whether the same elements are equally valid in large segments of the work-world hiring environments. Nonetheless, JST programs are not making maximum use of the research findings that do exist to inform the substance and content of their teachings.

One may conjecture about why this is so--why JST program leaders know so little and teach so little about the labor market. A number of explanations seem relevant:

a. Program designers have made a deliberate choice about the kind of training needed and about the best use of time in the JST program because of the limited resources and limited time with the participants.

b. There is much emphasis in the programs on the motivational, morale-building, and behavior-changing aspects of JST. There is no comparable emphasis on conveying substantive information about the labor market that would be useful to the participants. It is a reasonable hypothesis that one reason for such imbalance is a lack of knowledge of, and experience in, the labor market among program designers, operators, and instructors.

c. Programs, such as the WIN group job-seeking program, are strongly influenced by behavioral psychology. Theoretically, this orientation eschews information-giving and rests instead on a rigid behavior-changing format. The "why" is subsumed to "do it this way."

d. Many programs, including WIN, offer their commitment to "self-help" and a single strategy as the rationale for denying information and practical assistance or knowledge. The argument is made: "Let the

> labor market teach." Hence, the intervention of staff with advice, tips, or leads is "taboo," since it is seen as a violation of the self-help principle and a continuation of dependency. This goes so far that the use of the Job Bank, which is available to any job seeker who walks through the door, is regarded as a violation of the principle of self-obtained jobs (Jordan-Laurenti and Associates, Inc., 1981), and welfare clients are discouraged from its use. However, when ORC staff participated in a conference conducted for WIN group leaders where the proposition was advanced that labor market information was insignificant and of little value, the group leaders voiced considerable objections. In observing WIN programs, ORC observers found wide variation in how leaders actually dealt with these problems.

Making Choices--Targeting the Search

Included in this category is a wide and varied range of subjects and activities which are essentially designed to examine and surface the interior landscape of the participants--their skills, desires, values, qualities, selling points, and so forth. The intent is to narrow the target of the search. Approximately 90 percent of the programs spend anywhere from 7 to as high as 40 percent of their classroom time on activities that are connected with determining what kind of work a person should seek. The program goals, stated or implied, may range from "get any job" to "change the whole direction of your life." This matter of relating program goals to career or job choice is one of the most difficult for JST programs to resolve.

Every person who looks for work has to have some notion of the kind of work being sought to determine where to go and what to ask for. Every JST program has to deal with this issue, whether it is relegated to "pick three jobs you don't hate" or consumes two whole weeks of intensive career exploration. Participants often don't know enough about what people do on jobs or enough about themselves to begin the search, let alone make informed choices. Others make choices that are clearly unrealistic. Frequently, within the same group are those with work experience who know what they want but don't know how to get it, and those who don't know what they want but would be quite adept in job-search skills.

Occupational choice is but one personal choice factor confronting job seekers. Personal inclinations, values, and needs are often as critical. The ambience of the work place; the size of the firm, its location, hours and shifts, its products or servics; and even such amenities as what clothes are worn, the availability of a telephone for personal use, the existence of a cafeteria, a bowling team, all impact on job satisfaction, on need, and therefore on choice for search. To a woman with children, hours, distance from home, and wages sufficient to compensate for additional costs incurred by working may be far more critical than the tasks she will perform. To the father of a young family, the medical coverage in the fringe benefits can be a make-or-break consideration. The possibilities for future stability, upgrading, and incorporation into a protected position in an internal market structure, a trade union, or a Civil Service system may critically influence the trade-off decisions made by job seekers in planning or targeting their search strategies. The financial situation of the job seeker may pose the most serious determinant of all--the degree of urgency for immediate income.

As in all other matters, knowledge about the alternatives is valuable for making informed decisions and proceeding with purposeful action. The degree to which individuals can, in fact, control their own work life or are controlled by external organizational and structural factors is not at issue here. An individual job seeker, armed with knowledge, can determine whether Company A is a better place on which to concentrate his/her efforts than Company B. There are a host of decisions that do lie within the province of individual choice and need, if the person is made aware of alternatives.

The problems faced by JST programs in attempting to meet all of the different needs and choice issues are very real and do not yield to easy resolution. ORC observers found great variation in the field, with widely different approaches and philosophies. For instance:

- The proposed WIN technical assistance guide suggests that JST programs engage in a "light self-counseling activity which will help participants get used to examining their likes, strengths, and abilities." The employment goal chosen by clients is essentially unchallenged, and very little effort is spent in arriving at serious long-range occupational choices.

- The California EDD Workshop Leader's Handbook recommends that the participants' choices, both occupational and personal, be dealt with in a curriculum item entitled, "What Are Your Job Objectives?" Points covered include the following: What kind of job do you want? Why do you want it? What working conditions do you prefer? What satisfactions do you want? The workshop leader is advised to clarify the issues, with the help of the DOT, occupational guides, field office lists of going wage ranges, open and closed job orders, and other materials. However, there is no attempt at closure--the decisions made by job seekers are not subject to further examination. Participants are merely directed to consider these issues and, in some cases, are offered access to decision-making tools.

- The Self-Directed Placement program openly states to participants that the program does not undertake to provide vocational counseling, and does not generally question the choices voiced by participants.

- A number of programs separate occupational choice from job search and establish a distinct, separate module for that purpose, although it may be taught in the same locale by the same staff. At times, the matter of occupational direction is handled during the assessment process, prior to participation in JST. In fact, completion of the choice or assessment module is a prerequisite to participation in the search module in a few programs.

- Most programs incorporate some kind of self-assessment, "skills"-analysis process into their curriculum. Though this is usually offered under the rubric of choosing an occupation or targeting the job hunt, ORC observers found that there was no discernible bridge between the "skills," "likes," and "dislikes" and "accomplishment" exercises, and choosing an occupation or targeting the immediate search. The exercises appeared to be directed more toward developing a "package" to present to employers. Many users of the skills-analysis technique admit that the purpose is not to make an occupational choice, but rather to bring about a heightened self-concept and consequently a change of behavior in approaching employers.

- There are programs that treat occupational choice rather more deliberately and either recommend or themselves administer and interpret aptitude and interests tests to assist in the process, with individual counseling interviews scheduled.

- In those programs that are strongly influenced by the employment service, the targeting process is more related to a dissection of work-acquired skills and their occupational relevance as defined by the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

The enormous variations found in the ways JST programs handle participant choice bears little relationship to differences in the need and backgrounds of their clients. Instead, they appeared to reflect the particular bent of program designers and operators who draw from approaches prevalent in the field. These can be grouped under three broad headings, each of which has a unique body of core techniques, literature, and research. For the sake of clarity, they can be labeled the educational approach, the self-analysis approach, and the service-agency approach. In actual practice, the lines get fuzzy as borrowing between adherents occurs.

The Educational Approach: The educational model is used extensively in high schools and colleges where the clientele are normally enrolled students of the educational institutions. At the secondary level, this is often embodied in career-exploration classes, offered at the 11th and 12th grade levels. In colleges, the format may be that of short seminars, conducted by counselors who specialize in career planning, or it may be in a fully-credited course.

In this model, information is provided about the world of work which includes the characteristics of occupations and work environments, rewards, hazards, and prospects. The model also sets forth methods for evaluating work dimensions in personal terms as a basis for making decisions. The emphasis is on learning what the processes are for occupational choice, rather than arriving at the choice itself. The logic of the model begins with the personal characteristics, the psychological attitudes, and the values of the individual, then proceeds to relate these to various occupations. In a campus context, the model also influences educational choices.

The educational model makes extensive use of validated tests and individual counseling, and is rooted in a comprehensive body of educational psychology theories presented in the works of J.L. Holland, D.E. Super, and J.O. Crites. This model is directed toward a population with limited work and life experiences and for whom the economic need for decision and action is generally less pressing than it is for adults or for those with full attachment to the work force. Nevertheless, many elements of the educational model can be found in a number of JST programs addressing all kinds of people whose need is more urgent and whose alternatives may be considerably more limited than those of students.

The Self-Analysis Approach: Both the commercial literature and career-counseling firms in the private sector are advocates of this approach which lends itself to many variations. One of its major originators, Richard Bolles, has stated that he first developed it as a tool for ex-ministers who felt they had little to offer in the secular world of work which they were at that point confronting. The method and philosophy have subsequently been used with school teachers facing reduction-in-force layoffs, and with other professionals involved in career change. Originally appearing in Bolles' book What Color Is Your Parachute? the specific issue of occupational choice is subsumed by the general approach which perceives career planning as inseparable from life planning.

The key to the process is exploring the areas of interest in which there are natural talents and which are emotionally important to the person. It is less concerned with the education and work life of the individual. The talents, preferences, and achievements are analyzed and identified with a career direction. The approach is essentially future oriented, and the literature anticipates a serious commitment of time over an extended period to complete the process. Like the educational approach, it is aimed at identifying the person's potential and in teaching a process. The basic premises on which the method rests have yet to be validated by objective evidence.

ORC observers encountered at least one JST program that was fully committed to the complete Bolles method, although many programs drew from the approach and used the exercises. The Bolles' books are available and in use at many sites. In such programs, there is heavy dependence on the group process for social reinforcement and considerable emphasis is placed on "skills analysis." In observing the exercises for analyzing skills, there appeared to be little to distinguish occupationally relevant or marketable skills from personal accomplishments or gratifications, and work-acquired skills were seldom elicited. When conducted by leaders with little personal or professional familiarity with labor market realities and occupational variables, a sort of benign never-never land emerged, and it was difficult to see where a realistic plan for finding a "best bet now" job could emerge. Thus, "communication skills" were cheerfully assigned to a participant who had spoken up on a few occasions. (In labor market parlance, a person with "communication skills" is expected to be able to write articles and speeches, make speeches, use the media, appear on TV, etc.). When the curriculum called for a demonstration of accomplishments, a young man of truly limited capabilities who had been unable to hold a job in a gas station, produced a toy model he had put together. The leaders commented on the "mechanical skills" he displayed which caused the group to urge that he direct his search towards obtaining a mechanic's job. The only work experience of a 63-year-old woman had been a six-month stint as a telephone operator 20 years earlier. She had left school in the 8th grade and had spent most of her years raising a family on an isolated small farm. When pressed for her accomplishments, she said she occasionally crocheted. She was advised to pursue a career as a manager of a knitting and wool department in large retail establishments. For an experienced placement interviewer, finding any kind of work for these seriously unprepared individuals would constitute a major victory. It seemed that the week might have been more productively spent if a more realistic game plan had emerged.

The self-analysis method emanates from and is heavily directed toward individuals who are equipped to compete for professional, managerial, and highly technical occupations, and the techniques used imply a considerable level of verbal skills, and analytical and research capabilities. Watching the method translated into group form in any of the programs left ORC observers puzzled about its value. The material seemed weak and inappropriate when matched against the problems of the typical participants in JST programs. It was difficult to see any closure, any contribution towards making a rational occupational choice or in targeting the immediate search for work. Yet, participants appeared to relish the process and entered cheerfully into all the "skilling games." In a bemused, somewhat disbelieving aside to the ORC observer, the 63-year-old woman said, pointing to her "skilling" sheet, "Look at this. I never knew I was such a genius."

The fact is that to date, ORC researchers have not encountered any successful translation of this approach into group form for JST participants either in adult or youth programs. Perhaps such a translation can be accomplished, but it would require considerable creativity, thought, and the incorporation of a wider knowledge base. It should be understood that this critique is based only on the observed ability of this method to facilitate the occupational choice of the participants. It is not addressed to peripheral issues such as the possible therapeutic value of improved self-image and peer support.

Service-Agency Approach: The prototype of this approach to occupational choice resides in the processes used by ES local offices and, to some degree, vocational rehabilitation agencies. The clients are seeking the specific services of the agency, and, in most instances, their primary concern is gainful employment. They are usually not in school, although training may be a component of the services offered or a recommended step toward the long-range goal.

In the employment service, the process of targeting or choosing an appropriate occupation for a client actually has two levels which are identified with two different institutional functions. They are worth exploring because the differences between the two help to pinpoint the dilemma faced by JST programs, and offer some useful insights into alternative levels of depth, alternative goals, and methods.

Completion or Application Assessment Interviewer: A job seeker who comes into the ES local office looking for work is given a self-completing work application. A completion interviewer has the task of reviewing the application, completing and refining the data with the help of the individual. An occupational title and code is assigned from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. The code reflects "the highest skill level for which the person is qualified," and is assigned with the approval of the applicant.

To arrive at a title and code, the completion interviewer applies a job-analysis formula to the work history which consists basically of the questions: What did you do? How did you do it? Why did you do it? What was involved in doing it? The same basic formula is applied when recording a job opening from an employer. The job-analysis formula is the basis for classification and description of all 22,000 occupations appearing in the DOT.

If the work experience warrants more than one code, additional codes are assigned. If, however, the job seeker does not have work experience, all other factors such as education, volunteer work, hobbies, work preferences, etc., are considered. The agreed-upon occupational title and code is an entry code and does not carry the connotation of an experienced, qualified worker.

The process of eliciting occupationally significant factors and assigning a classification is relatively short, usually performed within ten minutes. The act of assigning an occupational code and title is almost the precise equivalent of targeting the immediate search and narrowing the occupational choice. It does not limit a person, but it does target the job which the person is best equipped to do now and is willing to accept. The process is clearly rooted in labor market realities.

Employment Counselor: The methods and goals of the employment counselor are significantly different from those of the completion interviewer when dealing with individuals who need to choose or change vocations. The client and the counselor are agreed about the problem and the goal: to arrive at an appropriate vocational direction consistent with the client's abilities, needs, desires, and limitations, and yet is realistic in the relevant labor market.

The theory that underpins the counselor's approach is derived from the characteristics related to a job--often referred to as worker traits--aptitudes, physical demands, temperaments, interests--and worker function--the degree of involvement with data, people, and things. The counselor makes use of the General Aptitude Test Battery, interest inventories, and other testing devices. The process usually involves repeated counseling interviews.

Occupational choices are arrived at from a synthesis of all of the data and agreed to by the counselor and counseled. The tools and tests used by the employment counselor have been tested and validated over the years by the Department of Labor.

Though the goals of both service agency functions described above are gainful employment, the differences between the two are clear. The counseling objective is a satisfactory long-range vocational choice. The counseling plan may, indeed, include stopgap employment to answer immediate needs, but the focus is on arriving at an agreed-upon vocational direction. On the other hand, the objective of the completion interviewer in arriving at an occupational title and code is to facilitate the movement of the person into an immediate job at the highest level that is realistically marketable.

The foregoing analysis suggests a number of problems that are unresolved in many JST programs:

1. It is questionable whether it is advisable or possible to combine JST with an in-depth attempt to arrive at vocational choice. Those programs that have attempted to do so seem to have trivialized the choice process to a point where its value is dubious. It is also uncertain that serious long-range choice decisions can be made in a group process, without individual counseling and testing.

2. JST programs need to delineate their attainable goals more carefully given the limits of time, the level of skill and knowledge of the leaders, and an awareness of who their client population is and what it is that they want. It does not seem feasible to incorporate both the goals of the completion interviewer and the employment counselor into a single activity conducted by relatively unskilled staff.

3. Programs that opt against extensive vocational exploration often fall into the reverse trap, as noted by ORC observers. They often fail

entirely to provide any kind of direction about "best bet" jobs when clients are uncertain, or to offer a critical response when the plan is clearly unfeasible. Not only does such a stance deprive the group of assistance, but the failure to personalize or to relate the best search methods to individual participant's realities tends to rigidify the curriculum and turn the experience into a mechanical process. ORC staff observed many occasions of neglect and unresponsiveness which were a consequence of excessive leader distance from the individuals involved. For example, a barely literate person declares that she is looking for clerical work as her first job. The JST leader has no response except to direct the individual to telephone the banks and insurance companies, though the participant was unable to fill out a work application in the group. A person is looking for a carpenters job in a heavily depressed market. The leader has him sit for hours telephoning all construction companies for an interview which is, of course, not forthcoming. In both cases, the JST program has not fulfilled its potential to equip either person with information that might have redirected the efforts into more productive paths. The time and resources of both the job seekers and the JST program have been badly spent. The frustration and irritation of the participant is unnecessarily increased rather than assuaged.

4. Approaches and techniques appropriate for individuals who have sought career counseling, who are equipped by education and experience to arrive at choices in professional, managerial, and technical occupations have been arbitrarily lifted and patchworked onto JST programs with very different kinds of people, with different needs, urgencies, expectations, and a vastly different range of realistic possibilities. The career choice field is permeated and dominated throughout by this orientation, and the content and the references throughout reflect such a bias. Images of a union hiring hall or an assembly plant never creep into the formulations or examples used.

5. A valid goal for JST programs could very well be to take the next step; any job, if there has been none or out of the secondary labor market, if that's where the individual has been, and into a better job, even within the same occupation. Such goals for a JST program would lie within the realistic limits set by the experience and training of the participants, and within the time limits of the program.

6. The example offered of the differences between the employment counselor's goals and those of the completion interviewer suggests a possible direction for JST programs. The process by which the interviewer arrives at an occupational title and code may well be translated into a usable and practical method in group format, with a clear explanation about its long range limitations. The advice offered about job search strategies would become far more personalized. A few programs have experimented with something akin to this approach. The fact is, JST programs undertake to train participants to perform the very difficult brokering job of "cold-calling" employers on the telephone. It should be possible to train leaders, and in turn, the group, to do what the completion interviewer has to accomplish in ten minutes--arrive at the most

reasonable, immediate job goal if the client is uncertain about what to look for.

In summary, each of the approaches and methods for vocational decision-making discussed in this section is unquestionably valid, useful, and appropriate for the population and in the setting for which it was developed. But the translation into a group activity suitable for the clients of JST programs has not yet been adequately developed and explored. ORC observers did not find any model that could be regarded as examplary and replicable. This matter of choice requires considerably more experimentation and probing.

Approaching the Search

This category incorporates all advice given about organizing the search, planning, preparing materials, intensity of time recommended, and "researching" the employer. Actually, few programs devote very much time to this issue as a curriculum item. However, it appears in a number of documents given to participants, some of which are official DOL booklets or ES state publications, and is often interspersed throughout the JST cycle.

Here, too, contradictory advice abounds, as well as considerable differences in emphasis. Those stipended programs that include the supervised search component generally tend to ignore all other strategies except the one to which they are committed. There is little offered beyond a few general dos or don'ts; an insistence that the search for work is a full-time job; people should be prepared for rejection; job seekers should be prepared with references, dates, etc. Time planning and record keeping are embedded in the supervision of the activity.

Other programs and program materials take a broader view and offer a range of advice, including the need to plan and organize the search geographically, in order to save time and money; follow all leads; keep a record of contacts made and interviews conducted for follow-up; find out everything possible about the company before going for an interview. However, some programs are opposed to a full-time search, maintaining that it is both unrealistic and too discouraging, a state of mind that is then imparted to the employer. Further, a few of the written documents suggest that indiscriminately following all leads and "milling about" is inefficient, time-consuming, and costly. Instead, the strategy recommended is to pin down the search, select the points of concentration in accordance with personal tradeoff decisions, and pursue them with persistence. One state-produced document recommends that job seekers develop a balanced search between "random inquiries and costly long-term planning."

Clearly, each stance is addressed to a different mental image of the job seeker, the hiring setting, and the appropriate strategies. However, neither in the written material nor in the presentation is there very much recognition given to the fact that different occupations and different industries might require different approaches. JST programs will not reach their potential until more careful consideration is given to the kinds of knowledge participants will need and the decisions they will have to make before beginning the job search process.

Chapter V

CONTENT ANALYSIS: THE SEARCH FOR A JOB

To conduct a search for work, job seekers must first discover where the jobs are that they can reasonably hope to fill and that fulfill their needs. After that, they must obtain access to and present themselves to the employer or his/her hiring agent in a manner that will effect a hiring transaction.

This chapter describes and analyzes how those processes are dealt with in JST programs under four headings: I. Finding the Job Openings, which is divided between use of labor market intermediaries and uncovering openings. II. Presenting Oneself to the Employer--The Written Word. III. Presenting Oneself to the Employer--The Spoken Word. IV. Follow-Up.

Finding the Job Openings

If knowledge is a valuable commodity, then job seekers need to be aware of the quality of information available from different sources. It is to their advantage to be knowledgeable about the relative efficiency, availability, and reliability of the different intermediaries for the particular occupation, industry, and skill level in which they seek work. This section assesses the information and advice offered in JST programs and appearing in the program literature about locating job openings. Here, finding openings is divided between formal mechanisms where openings are known to exist, and strategies for uncovering unlisted openings, which requires an additional step for the job seeker.*

Job Vacancy Information

Formal mechanisms that receive job-vacancy information which are most frequently acknowledged in JST programs include want ads, the employment service, and private employment agencies. A much smaller number of programs include civil service systems. Only occasionally are there references to community agencies, school placement, radio and TV announcements, trade magazines, and CETA. Only one program mentioned unions and only one program mentioned temporary help agencies. Apprenticeship processes were referred to in the literature, but none of the visited sites, including those specifically for youth, were heard to mention apprenticeships. The opinions expressed by leaders about these intermediaries and the advice offered about their value and use reveal considerable differences in perception, and substantial misinformation and prejudices about them in JST programs.

---

*Neither the literature nor the programs tend to make a distinction between formal mechanisms which list published openings and informal strategies for finding unannounced openings and the failure to do so results in considerable confusion. Want ads and yellow pages, for example, are both described as sources of job-opening information, when obviously only the want ads actually have listed openings.

Want Ads: Ten of the programs visited discouraged the group from using ads, declaring that they are "a total waste of time," "too competitive," "worse jobs," "mickey mouse jobs," "misleading," "same jobs every day." Five programs merely referred to them as a possible lead source. But four programs considered them the very best source of job information, and one used only want ad listings in the telephone room.

An ORC observer noted this incident: Want ads were handed out to youthful participants in the telephone room. One of the young people was exuberant as he completed the phone call, declaring that he had gotten an interview for a sales job. The leader gave him positive support and left the room. Uncomfortable, the observer suggested that he call the number back and ask for more details, such as whether he would get a salary, whether the company would supply leads, and whether he would have to prepay for the merchandise. He was saddened to discover that he would have to pay $70 for the gold jewelry which he could sell house-to-house or to friends, for which he would get only a commission. It was not at all what he had in mind. He wanted to work in retail sales. Want ads are filled with many such traps for the unsophisticated and JST leaders should be cognizant of them.

There seemed to be no relationship between the advice given about want ads and the make-up of the group or their occupations. Thus, a group with a number of clerical job seekers was advised against the use of want ads, and a group of youths was told want ads were the best job-lead source available to them.

Research about want ads suggests that they are generally a poor source of information for inexperienced workers, and a good source for clerical workers, the reverse of the preceding advice (Walsh, et al., 1975). The listing that says, "No experience required," is usually the kind that entrapped the young man. What is more, over the years want ads have accounted for a growing share of jobs filled. A synthesis of eight studies conducted since 1968 indicate that, on the average, nearly 16 percent of all those who found work did so through want ads (Mangum, 1981). The value of ads varies by the size of the community and the size of the newspaper. The time it takes to scrutinize the want ads and the cost of a newspaper are relatively insignificant for a job seeker. What is more, even if the particular job advertised is inappropriate, the ad does give indication that a company may be in some process of change or movement in its work force.

It is difficult to understand why JST leaders would categorically discourage and deter all of their clients from using this relatively easy, cost-free source of leads from which 16 percent of the workers do get jobs. Instead, it would seem far more appropriate if leaders facilitated their use by making the ads more comprehensible. Users should be made aware of traps such as commission-only sales jobs, which the young man had pursued; "dreams of glory" ads; pyramid selling; and listings of business opportunities and training schools under help wanted headings. They should make the job seekers aware that want ads include listings from the armed services, private employment agencies, and out-of-town companies which are intermingled with ads placed by local employers. Job seekers could scrutinize the section more quickly if they knew how the pages and columns were organized, where to look for the new jobs which are separated by some papers on the first day, and how to read the common abbreviations. If JST leaders studied their own newspapers, they would be far better equipped to warn their participants that most jobs may be inappropriate and subject to heavy competition, but that often, tucked in between the clerk-typist and engineering jobs, there may be an appropriate opening. However, ORC observers found that only a few programs handed out information about want-ad abbreviations, and only one warned about "pyramid-selling." Even those programs that recommended want ads and recommended them as a resource in the telephone rooms, including all WIN programs, fail to provide their clients with more sophistication in their use (Johnson, 1973).

Public Employment Service: Of the 30 visited sites, six made no mention of the ES as a possible resource, and five mentioned it without comment. Seven of the programs discouraged their groups from using ES facilities with comments such as, "Don't depend on agencies. Do it on your own," "They have nothing but bad jobs," "It's poorly administered," "Same jobs every day." Twelve programs suggested regular visits, but eleven of them were ES programs, sometimes administered in the local offices with Job Bank orders available. Only one employment service program actually advised the group about how to use the ES, emphasizing the folly of putting a high wage on the application, since the office had a computerized job-matching operation, and the application would be bypassed.

Whatever one may say (and much has been written) about the quality of ES jobs, many local offices display their jobs for easy access and often separate new jobs initially. Job seekers who learn to read and understand the job orders and how they are organized for display can usually assess their opportunities rather quickly. What is more, examining job orders offers a powerful learning experience about the nature of jobs, their requirements and specifications. It is an exposure to reality that is sobering.

The extent of ES penetration varies markedly in different communities and even more markedly by different occupations. The listing of mandatory orders and the demands of the EEOC have significantly increased the flow of professional jobs into the agency. They often go unfilled because the agency is used so little by that clientele. Many local offices have a heavy flow of clerical openings, which are generally no less desirable than those found in want ads and in private agencies.

ES interviewers are, in a sense, employer surrogates. As such, they are as subject to the personal impact of the individual job seekers, no matter how impersonally they attempt to conduct their business. If being liked is important to relations with employers, it is equally so with their agents. As with want ads, JST programs fail to advise their clients how to get maximum value out of the employment security system. There are hardly any interviewers in the ES who have not responded to individual applicants they have come to know personally or who have not been motivated by the persistent visits or phone calls of individuals. It is often to those individuals that the interviewer's mind turns when an appropriate new job appears, or when there is time for job-development efforts.

For participants to learn this is a lesson in manipulating a system, in getting it to serve one rather than being ignored by it. It is a way of setting oneself apart from the mass. What better practice and preparation for convincing an employer! It is hardly a violation of the principle of self-help. Dependency is passivity--waiting for someone to do it for you. Getting an interviewer to remember you and want to help you is an active step, similar to getting friends and relatives or former teachers to focus on you and remember your need for a job. Indeed, it is similar to getting an employer to notice and remember. Though job seekers should certainly be warned about the limitations of the employment service and should be discouraged from depending *only* on the ES system, it would be of more value to instruct participants how to get maximum advantage from the agency than to arbitrarily advise them against a weekly visit to a cost-free source of vacancy listings.

Private Employment Agencies: About half of the JST programs mentioned private agencies, and those that did generally warned the group about "fast shuffles" and the costs. Two programs actually recommended private agencies as the "quickest" and "best" sources of jobs, without any cost warning. A peculiar piece of information appears to be circulating in a number of programs, claiming that private employment agencies have "75 percent of all open jobs." This is grossly erroneous, since the share of jobs obtained through private agencies is less than 5 percent, according to studies conducted since 1968 (Mangum, 1981). Also, private agencies are strongly biased toward experienced clerical, sales, professional, managerial, and technical workers. None of the programs appeared to be aware of the distinction between the employer-fee-paying agencies and the applicant-fee-paying agencies, which makes a considerable difference to job seekers. Those agencies which require the employer to pay the fee are more likely to be of value to highly skilled applicants. It is the job seeker whose skills are in ample supply who must pay the fee.

It is puzzling that, with one exception, none of the JST program operators appeared to be aware of the use of temporary help agencies as a possible resource for their clients. One of the frequent paths into permanent work is through temporary jobs. Individuals get a chance to test the market, to overcome fear, to refine their skills. The field of temporary work has increased enormously, and agencies that act as labor contractors are beginning to operate across a wide range of occupations, from the unskilled workers to high level professions. It appears to be an overlooked resource. There is, of course, wide variation in the value of this intermediary by location.

Civil Service: Two of the four programs that mentioned civil service employment were designed to aid the transition of public service employment participants. As could be expected, the leaders of the two PSE programs spoke disparagingly about government jobs and extolled the virtues of private-sector employment in an effort to move their clients out of the public sector. None of the four programs described the distinction between federal, state, county, or city systems. Though civil service hiring is certainly at low ebb, it does seem that clients should be advised about civil service tests as a long-run investment. For many blue-collar workers, such as janitors, laborers, and even kitchen helpers, a civil service position represents a considerable improvement in stability and fringe benefits--a step up.

Uncovering Job Openings

With few exceptions, programs suggest one or more strategies for uncovering job vacancies that are not necessarily listed with intermediaries. The main ones are word-of-mouth, direct in-person contact with employers, and the yellow pages of the telephone directory. This subject also does not produce unanimity in emphasis, and contradictory advice is offered in different programs.

Word-of-Mouth: Mentioned under this heading are friends and relatives, "ask everybody," preachers, probation officers, Chamber of Commerce meetings, volunteer work, and, of course, the JST group itself. Many programs use the "network" concept--to get a job, people need to extend their network of personal contacts as widely as possible. However, programs do not agree about the relative values. For example, at least three programs warn participants that friends and relatives are often unreliable and that participants would do well to rely more on themselves--so far does the "self-help" commitment go.

Direct In-Person Contact with Employers: This strategy is often referred to as "cold calls," or "hit the bricks." About half the programs discuss this method. Here the disagreements are more pronounced. At least three JST programs consider this a "bad" way to look for work, time wasting, of little value, and urge their groups to stay away from this method. Others state categorically that appearing at the employer's establishment is the best way. Employers are favorably impressed with the personal effort, and it's harder to say "no" in person. Most important, job seekers have more opportunity to exert choice--to determine the location, observe the ambience of the work place, the behavior of the employer and other employees, and get a sense of whether they want to pursue employment there with more or less vigor. The California EDD Workshop Training Guide suggests that participants map their search geographically so that a maximum number of employers can be contacted for a minimum expenditure of time and carfare.

Direct Telephone Contact with Employers: The degree to which well-known models have influenced the entire field is evident from the fact that 21 of the 30 programs point to the yellow pages of the telephone directory as the best source for uncovering vacancy information. Those JSTs with a supervised search component provide telephone banks for participants to call companies selected from the phone book. In the Self-Directed Placement program, clients are limited entirely to the yellow pages as a source of listings. In others, including WIN, clients may make up their telephone lists from the yellow pages and other sources, including the want ads, City Directories, Chamber of Commerce directories, and ES printouts.

Conversely, there are programs that recommend the yellow pages only for the purpose of selecting employers to visit, not to telephone, while others recommend that the only employers to be phoned are those with personnel offices in order to ascertain whether they are taking applications. The sole concentration is on large companies. However, in the Self-Directed Placement program, there is insistence that clients telephone every number in a selected subsection to ensure that small companies, often overlooked, are telephoned.

Of particular interest to ORC observers was the advice offered about how to narrow down the selection from the yellow pages. This varies widely. One well-known model conceives of the yellow pages as generally divided by industry, and participants are asked to determine which "industries" are apt to hire people in their own occupation. Another program has prepared a document which provides broad occupational information for each yellow page subtitle in the local telephone book (One can assume that the community was considerably smaller than New York.) Another major model simply advises the group to pick companies for which they might like to work. Some offer no advice--just "use the yellow pages."

The telephone technique found in JST programs is discussed at greater length in another section. However, the decision of program operators about whether their participants should be asked to concentrate on small or large companies merits comment here. Most new jobs are created in smaller companies, one reason being that so many are born and so many die. In fact, 90 percent of all new jobs produced during the 70s came in businesses employing less than 250 persons (Birch, 1979). Small companies are most apt to allow for a variety of tasks, and often offer an opportunity for on-the-job training by journeymen and experienced people because the work may be less segmented and training processes are not formalized. For some people, the smaller company is just less overwhelming. Yet it is in the major firms that upward mobility is more apt to be ensured, raises are more formalized, fringe benefits may be more generous, and the organization of the internal market ensures greater stability. Program operators should be aware of the consequences of their direction to participants regarding size of firm, and job seekers would benefit from making those kinds of choices themselves if they were apprised of the relative advantages and disadvantages.

Presenting Oneself to the Employer--The Written Word

Job seekers present themselves for the employer's consideration through the written word or in person. The written documents include the employer's applications, resumes, and different types of letters. There is a singular lack of clarity in the field about the distinction in purpose and function between the employer's application and the job seeker's resume. The difference is analogous to the transaction between a buyer and seller of a used car. The seller shines the surface, cleans the interior, and fails to mention the recent accident--the resume. The knowledgeable buyer drives it, looks at its operating parts, listens to the motor, and has it tested. The buyer is looking for evidence of that minor accident as a potential risk factor--the work application. Interviewers in personnel offices or large companies, in the ES or in private employment agencies, must all be regarded as "knowledgeable buyers" or agents for the buyers. They become very adept at spotting risk points in the application and, indeed, in the resume as well. However, large numbers of employers who are not engaged in the hiring process are less apt to be knowledgeable buyers, which is one reason the task is often consigned to a broker. Employers engaged in frequent hiring for high-turnover, low-skill occupations are also less inclined to look for or make decisions based on stability and skill competence, since that is not the nature of their market. Generally, labor market intermediaries and knowledgeable employers do not use the resume for initial screening purposes at all. They use their own application.

The Work Application

Approximately 80 percent of the JST programs engage in some level of review of the work application. The time devoted to this ranges from 7 to 29 percent. Though most of the programs that deal with the application use sample forms and take the group through a line-item review, with advice on how to deal with each item, not many programs attempt to solve individual problems with the application. Only a few provide corrected master forms for the participants to take with them as a model.

About the only area in which there is agreement is that the application be neat, that it be carefully read, and that instructions be observed. Beyond that, disagreements abound on nearly every dimension. The following examples are illustrative:

Filling Out Applications: "Leave an application wherever you can. It can get you a job later." "Never leave an application unless there is an immediate opening."

Employer Behavior: "Employers check everything you say." "Employers never check anything."

Answering All Questions: "Leave a tough question blank." "Never leave a blank space; it looks like you ignored instructions."

Job Sought: "Pinpoint the job you want." "Never pinpoint the job you want. It hems you in." "Name the job you want, but add that you will consider others."

If Fired: "Say personal grievances." "Say, 'fired, will explain in interview.'" "Say 'reduction in force.' Employers don't check." "Never say 'fired.' Say 'terminated' or 'laid off.' Then explain in the interview."

Salary: "Say 'open' or 'negotiable.'" "Be realistic, but put it in." "Put in minimum wage. Don't price yourself out of the market." "If the wage is announced, put that in. If not, say 'open.'" "Refuse to answer, either on the application or during the interview, until the employer makes an offer."

Though the same kinds of divergencies can be found in what is taught about the interview, the positions taken by JST leaders about the application is more decisive because it is a screening device, and a written document for which individuals may be accountable even after they have started working. If answered improperly, it prevents the interview. Face to face, the job applicants could presumably overcome a potential risk factor.

Ethics is an encompassing concern that inevitably comes into play, whether introduced by the leader or the group. Does one tell the truth? How much and how little truth is expected? Do employers check? Leaders are regularly confronted with the problem, and the different responses can be traced to the origins of the program and its particular orientation. The differences can best be characterized by three examples:

Program A, a CETA model with rather strong messianic, therapeutic goals, urges absolute honesty, both on the application and in the interview. Leaders do not offer a labor market rationale for their position but rather base their advise on the personal ethics of the leaders and their perception of the therapeutic stance.

Program B, also under CETA aegis, is administered by a private entrepreneur. It not only disregards the truth, but actually dictates answers for everyone to use, whatever the facts: "Everyone check 'graduated' under 'high school education.' Everyone put down 'no' under 'physical handicap,'" and so on. The rationale assumes that employers seldom if ever check anything, and depends strongly on outwitting the employer who is perceived as essentially guileless and incautious. Some WIN programs also do this.

Program C, administered by ES staff, takes a middle position: "Don't provide information on the application that will screen you out. The purpose is to get the interview. Whether you like it or not, understand the game.

The employer has the power and owns the job. Honesty or dishonesty is your personal decision, but there are ways to tell less than the absolute truth or to postpone the truth until you are discussing it face-to-face in an interview."

The rationale strongly reflects the intermediary role. It is an advocacy position, on the side of the job seeker, but it doesn't attempt to impose ethical standards. The position basically assumes that the job seeker is no more obliged to offer self-incriminating information unnecessarily than the employer is apt to describe all of the negative attributes of a job. The same attitude is evident in the EDD Training Guide for Workshop Leaders.

In the face of such widely divergent opinions and instructions about the work application, we turn to the materials used to train professional brokers in both the public and private sectors and to the individuals with extensive experience in the intermediary role, to determine how well JST programs are capturing the attitudes and the risk issues most relevant to that critical screening point, the work application.

The biggest problem JST programs have with the application is what they fail to teach. Only two ES programs, of all the sites visited, placed emphasis on those issues that are most critical to the "knowledgeable buyer." Even most ES leaders appear to ignore their own training and experience as completion or placement interviewers.

It is a basic principle that anything that makes reviewing an application harder is an irritant. Simple things, such as reversing the order of the person's name, make filing difficult, or giving wage information in different units for different jobs (hourly, yearly) makes it harder for the professional or the employer to examine progression. Missing dates make chronology hard to follow. Inability to follow instructions on the application is not only a risk indicator for job behavior, it also complicates the reviewer's task. The fewer changes, notes, and clarifications necessary, the more benignly the applicant is initially viewed by the screener.

The area of greatest concern to the professional is the work history. It is there that the risk indicators are sought: how complete it is; how accurately and precisely the jobs are described; how tight it is chronologically; how rationally periods of non-work or unemployment are explained, including the most recent period; how long people last on jobs, and why they left them. Professionals become very adept at checking time spans, from the period a person left school until the present, or at least in the last five years. Dates are important. Unexplained gaps suggest hidden problems--jail, hospitalization, or living off someone else, a "red flag" to work-oriented reviewers. School, homemaking, out of the country, self-employment, all are rational explanations. Current extended unemployment is viewed very negatively. In fact, some of the largest private employment agencies are reluctant to grant full interviews to people who have been unemployed for more than two months. Job hopping indicates lack of stability and poor work performance for adults, less so for youth. The knowledgeable professional or employer is usually very aware of inflated job titles: the "sales/office managers" who managed no one but themselves, the "chef" who did short-order cooking, the "mechanic" who can only do tuneups. Hence, the probe for precise job duties.

The work history increases in importance the more distant it is from the school years. School, and other kinds of experience, increase in importance the shorter the work history. Individuals who have never worked are warned that their market is limited to entry jobs, and the establishment of a valid work history for a year becomes far more significant than the kind of work performed.

JST participants, especially in WIN and CETA programs, are, almost by definition, a population whose relationship to work has been unstable. It is one of their biggest problems in confronting employers, and it is possible that their own knowledge of that is in itself a cause for low motivation. Yet, in none of the CETA or WIN programs observed, not even in the proposed WIN Technical Assistance Guide, is this substantive problem of poor work history given the attention it is due. Programs were observed which spent hours teaching people how to write thank-you letters, resumes, whether to put a dash or "N.A." beside a question, and all manner of essentially cosmetic functions, but whose attention to the critical risk factors in the work history was limited to "have the dates ready." Individuals need help to organize their job histories and to formulate ways of obscuring the negative indicators on the application or in successfully confronting those issues in the employment interview. If a spotty chronology is organized and cleaned up, the job seeker may be emboldened to go to a range of places which require a work application that otherwise would be avoided.

The EDD Training Guide for Workshop Leaders and the Training Unit for Completion Interviewers offer a wealth of insights, both into the way a professional looks at a work application and how the job seeker can best deal with the problem. The Training Guide contains an especially useful way to group jobs and block time for people with a series of short-term jobs. The written program handouts and the Department of Labor Job Service Information Program materials contain far better information than is used in verbal presentations at most JST sites. But few ES programs have translated the material into a useful workshop format so that help on the work application can be offered to the individual participants. One ES program demonstrated the job analysis formula as applied to the work history. A few other ES programs provided the group with the DOT from which to draw proper job-descriptive language. One of the most innovative ideas noted was developed by the State of Oregon. As an aid to job seekers, a list of common occupations was developed, with the language of job duties and skill descriptions for each, for use on the application and in the interview.

The importance of the work application varies widely by occupation. A skilled ten-year machinist would hardly be excluded from a job if the application was messy and semi-literate. The occupational variance in the importance of the work application has yet to be determined by research. The care and scrutiny that employers exercise will vary greatly. Nevertheless, a JST program has not adequately assisted its participants unless each person can present a work application to the most discerning employer or professional without being automatically ruled out of the competition. How to accomplish this within a group is a technical problem, but the first step surely involves training leaders to comprehend the really important deterrents.

Resumes

About half of the JST programs spend a sizable portion of their training time on resumes. The other half either oppose resumes as a job-getting tool or mention them only briefly. A few programs, mainly short-term ES-sponsored ones, merely provide written handout materials or pamphlets describing how to prepare a resume.

ORC observers did not note disagreement in the field about how to write a resume. All programs use essentially the same material and the same instructions. Almost all describe the difference between a functional and chronological resume. The Azrin Model devotes extensive effort toward the development of a two-page, single-spaced resume, which is twice as long as is generally recommended. However, none of the WIN programs observed followed that model, nor does the proposed WIN Technical Assistance Guide.

The training process depends heavily on handout materials, sample resumes, and instructions. One observed program used the Bolles "skills analysis" process (Bolles, 1981) to design resumes. Another CETA program has a resume specialist on the staff who produces a well-worded "package" for each participant. This is an interesting model variation, emulating the professional career-counseling companies in the private sector.

A few programs have developed shortened combined versions of a resume and work application which ensure that job seekers have with them all the relevant information for filling out the employer's application and selling themselves on a job. Participants are urged to attach the resume to an employer's application and to bring one to an interview for reminders. The literature recommends that resumes also be used in solicitation campaigns, but no programs were heard to suggest this.

Personnel in the field differ on whether the resume is a useful labor market tool, especially for lower-skilled workers and youth. Since ORC observers were unable to identify any research on this subject that applied to lower-skilled occupations, it remains in the area of conjecture.

Several leaders of JST programs spending considerable time on resumes suggested that their job-getting value was secondary to other gains from resume preparation. A variety of alternative objectives were offered: "It builds self-confidence," "It sets off the person, especially in occupations that never use them," "It's a way for the applicant to control the interview," "It's an 'up' experience for the kids," and other such morale-building, "packaging" goals.

There is some evidence that employers are becoming more cautious about overstatements and exaggerations on resumes. Time magazine (May 11, 1981) published a story entitled, "Creative Fiction," that was concerned with a "rampage of resume fraud." It reported estimates that up to 40 percent of all resumes do not "accurately portray what an individual has achieved." The occupations associated with resumes in the story were of the highest level involving $80,000-a-year jobs. Though the story suggested that the distortions and dishonesties were effective, employers and their personnel offices appear to be becoming increasingly leery of "hype" and distortions in resumes and applications. In a television interview with a personnel officer of a major firm, it was suggested that the educational qualifications were represented dishonestly on over 50 percent of the applications and resumes.

Letters

About a third of the observed programs spend a relatively minor portion of their time on different types of letters appropriate for the job search. They include the following: "thank you for the interview" letters, letters of application, letters answering a newspaper ad, cover letters (either with the resume or application), letters written in a soliciting campaign to a large number of firms, letters to family or friends asking for support while in Job Search Training--a WIN requirement--and letters to former employers asking for references.

One major program considers the "thank-you" letter to an employer following an interview of particular value, and recommends the use of colored paper to distinguish it from the usual white paper flow. ORC staff also observed one program that spent an entire afternoon on letters in such detail that participants were asked to practice the proper way to fold the letter and to address the envelope. The participants were all welfare mothers.

Presenting Oneself to the Employer: The Spoken Word

Job seekers often speak to employers in formal desk interviews, but often also in informal encounters. Increasingly, they contact employers by telephone, or speak to them in informational interviews.

The Interview

All JST programs attempt, to one or another degree, to prepare job seekers for the interview. It is the single most time-consuming item in most programs, taking from 21 to 60 percent of classroom time. It is the most concentrated component of job search training, particularly in the stipended CETA and welfare programs. This is understandable, since there is widespread belief that the interview is the most critical determinant in getting a job.

Most ES programs are too short for adequately training interview skills, but offer the advice in lecture and written form.

Immediate Impact. Some programs insist that decisions about hiring are made in the first 90 seconds of the interview. Hence, the concern with immediate impact: appearance, body language (sit forward in the chair, keep eye contact), don't light a cigarette unless the interviewer does, don't chew gum, go alone, do (or don't) offer to shake hands (some programs insist that women shouldn't shake hands), be early, be prepared with all relevant papers, know something about the company first. Emphasis on appearance varies. A frequently seen handout describes what women and men should or shouldn't wear. Other programs dismiss the matter with, "Dress how you think people dress on that job."*

Content of Interview. Circulating throughout the country are various lists of "Commonly Asked Questions" and "Stress Questions," which are used by project staff for mock interviews, and sometimes to be completed as homework by participants. They form the basis for training in interviewing skills and preparing the job seeker with ready answers. One major program emulates the employment agency and uses the applicant-completed work application as the basis for mock interviews, rather than the canned questions.

The "Commonly Asked Questions" list, numbering anywhere from 16 to 150 questions, has been circulating for many years, and its source is lost in antiquity. It is not really known whether these questions are the most likely ones to be asked in clerical, semi-skilled, and unskilled, or even skilled blue-collar occupations. In fact, some evidence emerged from the ORC youth demonstration project that the program's interview training was wide of the mark when set against the actual events that led to being hired. In follow-up interviews, a puzzling 50 percent of those who found jobs answered "none" when asked how many interviews they had obtained during the period in which they actually found a job. How is it possible to get a job without being "interviewed?" It became clear that the interview training they had received in the workshops had envisioned a formal desk interview during which a series of questions were somberly asked. Apparently, there was no such formal "interview" when they got their jobs.

---

*In the training literature of the private agencies, the most important first impressions that cause staff to give short shrift to the interview also include appearance, but are equally concerned with liquor on the breath, sunglasses, and indications of residential instability, such as hotel addresses.

Different job sites and occupations may present the job seeker with very different circumstances at the hiring point. Recognition of this was demonstrated at only one of the visited programs. A group of employers provided regular assistance to one of the youth JST sites by having employer visitors, offering free hairdos and haircuts, lectures from the telephone company on phone techniques, and other types of assistance. One of the regular outside speakers is a local banker. He presents himself to the group in his banker role and conducts mock interviews with the participants. He then leaves the room, changes into jeans and a work shirt, and returns as the foreman of a construction crew, an owner/worker in a restaurant, an owner/worker in a small manufacturing firm or whatever, and roleplays that hiring situation with the youngsters. It is ironical that a banker provided the only evidence encountered of awareness that hiring environments may vary.

As with the application card, JST programs define the most serious potential client liabilities in the interview as those unrelated to work history, i.e., "Fired is the only work-related concern." The advice about how to deal with them includes: "Turn the negative into a positive;" "Treat the subject lightly and pass on;" "Don't offer too much detail;" "Assure the employer that whatever the problem was, it's now solved." All programs warn against "bad-mouthing" a former employer under any circumstances. The advice is essentially: "If the problem was yours [absenteeism, lateness, etc.] say the problem is now solved. If it was the employer, nothing is to be gained by complaining about the firm to the possible new employer. You might bad-mouth him, too."

JST leaders appear to stress honesty much more in the interview than on the application card, perhaps because it is step closer to being hired, and the employer is more apt to check the verbal information before making a final decision. Dishonesty revealed at that point could conceivably be decisive.

Just as with the application, there is a singular lack of focus in the interview-training process on the content of work history, explanations for long periods of non-work or job hopping. Few of the mock interviewers focused on asking people to describe in detail their former jobs in any detail.

Interviewing Style

It is in the realm of how job seekers should behave during an interview that the personal predilections of the program operators most affect the advice offered. At heart, the advice encapsulates a model image of that encounter held by the program operator. "Negotiations between equals" can best characterize one model: it teaches job applicants to be active, talkative, assertive, to "control" the content of the interview, to ask questions, to press for a decision date, to talk about accomplishments on previous jobs that saved the employer money, to make small talk, to brag. It has strong "hard-sell" qualities.

At the other end of the style spectrum is what can be characterized as the "supplicant before authority" model. The image is one of returning the serve on a tennis court: respond to the questions; offer little information beyond what is asked; keep the answers very short; respect the time of the interviewer; be very honest; don't ask questions--especially don't ask about wages, benefits, or working conditions since employers are offended by people whose only interest is money. The two models are posed in extreme terms for the sake of clarity. In fact, they sometimes intertwine. For example, most programs agree that wages and benefits should not be raised by the job seeker until the job is offered, because the job seeker is then in a better bargaining position, and is always free to refuse if the offer is too far below expectations.

Closing the Interview. To some program operators this is a more critical point than the initial approach because it leaves the lasting impression. It is the point when people are asked if they have any questions. Those JST programs that advocate the "negotiations between equals" stance usually provide participants with lists of appropriate questions about the job, wages, working conditions, and so forth. People are urged to demonstrate interest in the company by asking questions about the firm, its products or services, and its future. The programs that are more inclined toward the supplicant role urge their clients to ask no questions and remain essentially passive.

ORC's own experience as an employer offers a bit of insight. When interviewing candidates with Ph.D.s for a research associate position, the ORC staff, interviewing in group, were markedly turned against those applicants who asked no questions. This implied an absence of interest or intellectual curiosity about the nature of the proposed research. Even impressive credentials did not overcome that very negative indicator. However, when the staff interviewed candidates for a research secretary position, the hiring decision was far more influenced by other job related considerations than whether or not the candidates asked questions. As with so many other job search techniques, appropriate behavior is largely determined by occupation.

A few of the programs also advise people to (1) thank the interviewer for the time, (2) ask for other leads, if the job is unattainable, and (3) ask for a decision date. Oddly, none of the programs advised people to finish their interview by informing the employer that they would like to have the job. The mere fact that a person is at an interview doesn't necessarily insure that he/she wants the job after hearing the details. A job seeker may also be shopping, exploring, uncertain. Informing the employer of the decision can be a strong influencing factor in the employer's mind.

Training in Interviewing Skills. Short programs, generally ES run, do not attempt to provide any training component, either in interviewing or anything else. They inform participants about desirable interviewing behavior in their lectures, discussions, and in written form. However, most extended JST programs do offer some form of training and practice in interviewing.

Training consists of practicing--emulating the real interviewing situation. When the program has video equipment the practice interviews are recorded and played back to the group so that individuals can see themselves in the role and can engage in critiquing and correcting their own behavior as well as hearing responses from the rest of the group. Without video equipment, enactment takes place before the group in a regular role-playing situation with comments from the leader and the group.

Employer roles are played by the leader, the staff, other participants, or by employers who volunteer their services. The use of the participants as the employers appeared to be uniformly unsuccessful since participants are not particularly adept at assuming the employers' role, even with a canned question list. The use of visiting employers or their agents to role play also has proven problematical, many of them being not very competent as interviewers. The leaders and other experienced agency staff members appear to be most adept at the authority role.

The use of the video equipment presents JST programs with a variety of technical and logistical problems such as having the space necessary for a separate video taping room, the staff necessary to continue running the group while individuals are called out and taped, and the time required to video tape every participant and play all tapes back to the group. For example, in one program with 33 participants, the lone leader took each person into a separate room for taping, spending about five minutes with each. That took nearly three hours, during which time the rest of the class was unattended and assigned to do "homework." An even longer period of time was required to play each of the 33 tapes back to the group and invite responses. In other programs, including the ORC youth demonstration--Job Track--the class went on with one leader as, one by one, people were called into the video room where the other leader or another staff person conducted the interview. Operating the equipment was also a problem. In a few programs, participants were asked to do so. In fact, no program visited had adequately resolved all of the technical problems associated with the use of the video.

In most programs, employers' questions in practice interviewing were "canned," questions drawn from the "stress question" lists. However, the most successful model noted, which was emulated in the ORC youth demonstration, was the use of the uncorrected work application prepared by the participant as the basis for the practice interview. This is generally what occurs during the job search, and it offers the JST program an effective way of dealing simultaneously with the mistakes in the application and in correcting interviewing errors. However, this is best done by an experienced person who can quickly spot the risk issues in an application form.

Critiquing the practice interview was also somewhat haphazard, often lacking focus and group participation. There didn't appear to be adquate use of the modeling technique--demonstrating a better way to deal with a problem. In fact, presenting participants with role models of good interviews was not at all evident.

In general, however, the use of the video offers the single most effective and enjoyable training device observed. Uniformly, participants, even those who were initially hesitant and reluctant, expressed approval of the training. However, most programs have time for only one rehearsal for each participant. It is questionable whether this is adequate to effect actual behavioral changes, especially for the participants with more serious communication problems.

The wide differences in attitudes and teaching about the employment interview found in JST programs prompts us to turn again to the available objective data. An article appearing in Personnel and Guidance Journal (Galassi, 1978) offers an excellent synthesis of the relevant literature on employment interviewing. The findings are organized into a proposed training model to prepare clients to interview more effectively. Though the article is directed to individual counselors, it is entirely relevant to JST programs. The ensuing material draws heavily on that article and on the staff training materials of ES and private agencies.

Though the employment interview is the most widely used method of selecting employees, it is concluded to be a costly, inefficient, and usually invalid device. The research suggests that performance during the interview bears little or no relationship to how an applicant will perform on the job and the results are often prejudicial to applicants. Nevertheless, since employers persist in relying on that method above all others, there is a clear need to prepare individuals for the job interview.

An important phase of any training program designed to improve interviewing techniques is educating the clients about the interviewing process itself so that they can develop realistic expectations. The curriculum should include some theoretical constructs about different types of interviewing methods, content, length, different roles and styles of interviewers that they may encounter, and what the role of the interviewee should be. For example, participants in JST programs should understand the difference between a structured and an unstructured interview. In a structured interview, standard questions are asked in prescribed order, while in an unstructured interview, the interviewer pursues whatever line of questioning seems most appropriate at the time. Most large companies prefer structured interviews because they believe that greater reliability and validity can be attained.

Interviewers in both the ES and the private employment agencies are trained in the structured interview. The form of the interview is usually determined by the document in hand, in most cases the work application. This is the information gathering phase of an interview, and the agenda belongs to the interviewer. If the interviewer loses control of the interview, the task cannot be completed. The only appropriate role for the job applicant is to cooperate and provide the information as well and as directly as possible. Any attempt by the job applicant to control the interview during that phase of the process is diversionary and irritating.

In JST, participants would be much aided if they were forewarned that in either type of interview the style may vary from warm and supportive to cold and even rude. Some professional interviewers limit the applicant to very brief remarks, and others encourage the applicant to do most of the talking. A considerable amount of anxiety might be reduced if the JST participants understood that they might encounter a wide variety of styles and interviewing manners which are not of their making, to which they may have to adapt. What is more, there is considerable variance in the relative importance of different aspects of the interview according to the occupation. For example, subjective, non-job-related factors such as communication and interpersonal skills are far more important in managerial and executive positions, of lesser significance in clerical and technical jobs, and of very little significance in most manual labor jobs. A first rate craftsman does not jeopardize his value if he is relatively silent, taciturn, or inadept in verbal expression.

The authors of the article stress the importance of teaching job seekers to focus their presentation on the objective, job-related characteristics in the early stages of the interview and to intersperse that focus throughout. The purpose is what the authors refer to as "image management"--presenting oneself honestly but in a way that does not allow the interviewer to develop negative impressions based on subjective factors unrelated to job performance. In fact, the literature offers considerable insights which would be helpful to JST operators.

None of the JST programs suggested to participants that there were different interviewing styles and methods, and different hiring environments in which the interview might take place. All, without exception, posed a single situation and emphasized only their own particular view of what to expect. All JST programs would benefit from mining the research literature about employment interviewing, and sharing knowledge about the interviewing process itself with their clients.

Informational Interviewing

This technique, which is quite prominently described and recommended in the commercial literature, particularly in the Bolles books, had found its way into three programs as part of the training process. In five additional programs, the method was discussed and advice offered, but the activity was not part of the curriculum. In one sense, informational interviewing is the most recent entry in the lexicon of work-search techniques.

ORC researchers observed one program in which informational interviewing was a scheduled activity. The program offered a two-week career-choice focus, followed by Job Club. The heterogeneous group included, among others, a black 18-year-old who had never worked, a welfare mother, an incarcerated seaman on work furlough, and two upper-class, non-CETA eligible, middle-aged women referred by a private agency, who were permitted to sit in. The preparation of the participants, their dispatch to the field in pairs, and their return after the completion of their initial informational interviews (participants made their own selections about who to interview) were all observed. It was a remarkable visual demonstration of a "high"--all 13 participants were excited, full of information, astonished at their success, and just plain "turned on." People, reticent and timid all week, were fighting for the floor to describe their experiences.

Job seekers are instructed to seek out information about the industry, firm, and occupation of individuals, but not to ask for a job. The interview is projected as a form of choice research--find out what people actually do in a company or occupation of interest. The approach assumes that people are usually cooperative and eager to describe their company or their work. Generally, the method is intended for highly qualified individuals involved in determining new directions. The technique is used by commercial career-counseling firms that charge rather high fees.

In discussion with program personnel who recommend this technique, and particularly in observing it, it became obvious that the goals underwent considerable adaptation when translated to JST participants. Though it was presented as "research" and a way of extending a person's "network," participants were also informed that, on the average, 25 percent of the participants actually got jobs through this method. However, to the observer, the greatest value appeared to be a remarkable loss of fear and apprehension about talking to people which, one would expect, would be carried over into the job search.

Unquestionably, the short duration of many programs raises the question about whether it makes sense to use time for this activity. Many program operators felt that it was particularly inappropriate for JST clients and youth. Such judgments are certainly belied by the one ORC observation. It was, without question, of inestimable value to all of the participants.

Telephoning Employers

Of the visited programs, ten had a supervised search component which involved the use of banks of telephones by participants. None of the relatively short, unstipended, mostly ES programs provided this supervision or the telephones, though almost all recommended this method for uncovering vacancies and getting interviews. One PSE program didn't provide the telephones, but did dwell heavily on role playing and providing scripts. The time allocated to the supervised search, mainly centering on the telephone room, ranges from two hours a day for two weeks, when the scarcity of telephones requires assignments, to eight hours a day for three weeks. WIN programs formally allow three months of supervised search, but few cover expenses for the whole period. Programs also vary widely on how many telephone calls the participants are expected to make in a day and the degree of supervision. Some programs require the participants to turn in their work sheets as a prerequisite for stipend payment or allowance. All programs provide scripts for different types of situations and train clients in their use.

The telephone room techniques have been lifted, almost intact, from the procedures used by private employment agency counselors and EDD interviewers when doing job development. The Guide to Train Interviewers in Job Development in EDD and the materials from various private employment agencies offer clear analogies. When interviewers in either institution do not have an appropriate job listing on file and do have a "salable" applicant at the desk or in mind, they develop a job by calling companies directly. They speak only to the person who does the hiring and "sell" their client--get the employer to agree to an interview. Interviewers are warned not to call unless there is a client and not to seek any commitment other than the interview. Though these professional brokers usually have access to companies with which they have done business or about which they have information on file, they also often resort to the yellow pages, as well as to the want ads. In the private agencies, there are multiple purposes for making 200 calls a day besides obtaining an interview, among which is the development of new business. National officials of the industry association have estimated that 70 percent of their placements are obtained through the aggressive method of unearthing openings, rather than from those jobs already listed.

In translating this method and teaching it to JST participants as an approach to getting themselves a job, the developers retained the instructions to talk only to the person who does the hiring; they developed telephone scripts to assist the job seeker; they retained the principle of red-lining the most immediately positive or salable points on the application; and they retained the goal--to get a direct interview, rather than engage in a phone interview. The instruction to keep the conversation very brief is also retained, so that a maximum number of employers can be contacted in the minimum time, which is also a major concern for the professional broker.

The idea of teaching a job seeker this aspect of the broker's job is ingenious and has been a major contribution that permits the institution to supervise the search--to retain some measure of control over the time and effort of participants who are, after all, being paid to look for work in stipended CETA programs and in WIN. It concentrates the search, increases its intensity, and does indeed produce interviews which produce jobs. There can be little doubt that this innovation is the turning point, the critical difference that distinguishes the current JST programs from the historical attempts to teach job search skills in stipended programs such as the Concentrated Employment Program and traditional WIN programs. Giving information without translating it into supervised client activity did not change the basic distribution of responsibility between client and institution--it was still up to a job developer to do the work, to get the job for the client on a one-to-one basis. The new method, supervised and in group format with all of the potential for positive impact of group support, took the issue in hand. It provided a way to coerce the participant into an active and aggressive effort, while being underpinned, encouraged, and assisted.

The process is difficult, tedious, and particularly frightening for non-verbal timid people. The professional broker has advantages over the individual job seeker, aside from training, experience, or possible aptitude. To start the conversation with "This is George Smith of the ABC Employment Service" or "This is the public employment service" is much easier and produces a very different response than does an individual job seeker when making the call. It is far easier for the broker to say, "I have a first-rate applicant who looks great and has a wonderful personality," than it is for a person to say that about her or himself. It is not fortuitous that programs using this method almost inevitably have curriculum items devoted to teaching people how to "brag," how to "package" themselves, how to give a three-minute TV commercial about their virtues. Most people are naturally reluctant to engage in aggressively immodest behavior and have been conditioned against it. For the telephoning method to be successful, people have to be retrained to overcome such reluctance--even more than would be necessary in direct contact with employers or during an interview. Like the broker, they have to command the employer's interest quickly enough to get an interview, depending only on a disembodied voice.

It is, therefore, understandable that program operators often describe the many devices people use to ease out of the process. For example, volunteer participants in the WIN program tend to drop away at the point when the class repairs to the telephone banks. Of course, those who persist generally succeed in getting an interview which, in turn, increases the motivation.

ORC observations of the supervised search, particularly in the telephone room, were limited. Project resources prohibited more than a week's stay at a site, which usually occurred during the classroom period. Also, program operators were extremely reluctant to permit observations of the phone room since it tended to make participants, already apprehensive, even more uneasy. The design usually calls for extensive practice sessions, a buddy system, role playing, listening devices, and other training methods. In actual observation, ORC did not see evidence of these processes and noted little supervision in the telephone room. It was also evident that scripts provided by the program were quickly abandoned, as responses were unpredictable and people's natural styles asserted themselves.

However, ORC staff noted a number of serious omissions in preparing people for the phone room which, if overcome, might well facilitate the process and spare participants frustration and unnecessary efforts. Neither in the instructional handouts nor in the verbal instructions were people given any directions or warnings about the selection of companies. The following are a few examples: no one is warred that before selecting a company the location should be checked for accessibility and travel time; no warnings are offered about the customary practice of large company personnel offices to be available and open for any walk-ins, which makes the telephone call unnecessary; no one is warned against calling service establishments at busy times. A host of such insights have not been accumulated or dispensed. Yet, within the relatively brief periods of observations, ORC staff saw repeated incidents that could have been avoided, which were frustrating, misleading, and often time consuming to the job seeker. One participant expressed great pleasure at having obtained an "interview" when, in fact, the utility company he called, which has a permanently open personnel office, simply told him to come in. Another job seeker was dismayed when he called a garage early Monday morning to be greated with explosive irritation at the bad timing. Again and again, ORC observers watched participants who, following instructions to ask for an interview, were informed by the personnel office that company policy required that an application be on file before an interview was granted. A young person came in, after presumably going out for an interview, to announce that he couldn't get there without a car, which he didn't have. He was too dejected to start with the phone again. Yet, no matter how often such mishaps occur, not a single program has felt impelled to forewarn its clients. It is puzzling, because many of the programs have been running for a considerable period of time and the staffs must have repeatedly observed their clients struggling with the same rebuffs, or selecting only large companies with personnel offices. How is it that they were not impelled to develop a list of companies not to call or, at the very least, to develop a series of facilitating instructions other than scripts?

The failure to respond to an obvious need is worrisome. It suggests that curriculum and models become so embedded, so set in concrete, as to lose any flexibility or vitality. Worse, it raises the spectre that despite protestations to the contrary, the entrepreneurial view of the client is mainly manipulative, lacking the necessary commitment, the humanism that motivates the extra effort to facilitate and ease an essentially difficult task. A JST program is obliged to provide the best tools, the best advice, and the best assistance within its resources to its participants.

Follow-up

Follow-up refers to those actions that a job seeker might take after the initial contact has been made or the interview has taken place. Few programs consider this a curriculum item, but nearly every program suggests some type of action. The most common piece of advice is that the job seeker should not wait for the employer's decision, but should telephone (some say drop in), not only to find out, but to jog the employer's memory and display serious intent. Both the WIN TAG and the Self-Directed Placement program insist on follow-up thank-you letters as a way of impressing the employer and getting attention.

All of the advice rests on the assumption that a hiring decision is yet to be made about a particular open job, and is therefore directed toward influencing that decision. The image of where the interview occurred is that of a comparatively small company with a single opening, where the person interviewing also makes the hiring decision.

In fact, the advice is quite narrow and fails to consider a wide variety of hiring environments, including the large personnel offices that are notified of openings continually by various departments in the company. More important, JST programs generally fail to deal with the strategies that job seekers should use to get into companies, unions, apprenticeship programs, or industries that they have a particular desire to break into. This often takes persistence, repeated calls, efforts to get to know the gatekeepers, someone on the inside, eating lunch where crew or foreman may eat, getting to know the union business agent or dispatcher. Many employers have stated that persistent efforts are the single most compelling convincer of a person's seriousness and work ethic. Representatives of different Joint Apprenticship Councils, when questioned about the kind of persons they seek to indenture, concluded that persistence of effort to get in was the single best indicator they had of commitment to the trade. Again, getting a "good" job takes very different strategies than getting "any" job. This point is also seriously neglected in most JST programs.

Conclusion

This concludes the presentation and analysis of what it is, generally, that JSTs are teaching their clients. There is no doubt that, outside of common sense and common courtesy, there does not exist an irrefutable, undisputed, validated body of knowledge that underpins the content of most JST programs. Widely circulated mythologies pervade the field, either because the existing body of relevant knowledge does not inform the major innovators, operators and service deliverers, or because the research has not yet been done that would lift it out of the realm of excessive conjecture and personal opinions, and into the real job world.

The critique of what is taught and done in JST programs has been sharp, but this should not obscure the fact that a substantial service, helpful to many, is being provided. Enough programs report sufficiently high success rates to indicate that participants do better in finding jobs than they would have without JST.

The point is that JST programs might be more productive if there were a better fit between what they teach, the real problems and needs of those who are taught, and the external realities of the job-getting process. The purpose of this analysis of JST program content is to stimulate thought and effort towards that better fit. Hopefully, it will encourage the kind of labor market research that will provide JSTs with a firmer and more comprehensive knowledge base about what really takes place in the job search processes and in different occupations and hiring environments. The JST potential for educating and motivating the people they serve can only be enhanced if the substance they impart reflects the complexities of the job world as accurately as possible.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Though this state of the art study does not purport to be an evaluation, job search training programs appear to be a significant social intervention. They have the capacity to improve job search skills and increase the intensity of effort of a wide spectrum of job seekers, from welfare recipients to executives. There is strong evidence that JST programs meet with much public favor. In contrast with other types of employability training programs, JSTs are reasonably short, low cost, and effective. Because of their group format, they are particularly suited to the capabilities of public agencies whose services to the public are increasingly needed and whose resources are continuously reduced.

The rise of JST programs has, for the most part, been a bottom-up effort, pushing their way into national consciousness from the service delivery point. In that diverse and fragmented process, a rich array of JST models have emerged. Some have been widely emulated nationally and have dominated the field. These models, on the whole, embody a variety of influences that are not always appropriate or relevant to the population served. They also reflect the employment and training environment in the recent past which provided a fairly substantial resource base from which to draw. Thus, these influential models have been generally leisurely, expansive, and well-endowed. It is doubtful that the new atmosphere which pervades the employment and training arena will encourage the retention of these same models, particularly the length of the program cycle and in the availability of full stipends to participants. Clearly, if JST continues to be offered to the job seeking public on a widespread scale, new models will have to emerge that are more responsive to the new budgetary realities.

Major administrative and congressional decisions about the future shape of employment and training delivery systems are yet to be made. Speculation about these policy decisions is beyond the scope of this study or the crystal ball capacities of the authors. Nevertheless, it is not irrational to speculate that the policies eventually adopted will support and legitimize a JST effort--that JST programs, in one form or another, will continue to be a service component of a national employment and training system.

Heretofore, the JST alternative has suffered from persistent neglect and lack of oversight from national policy makers and administrators. At this point, national guidance and leadership is needed to increase the effectiveness of this component. In anticipation of its future value to that leadership, ORC offers a synthesis of findings which represent the most minimal needs, gaps, and unanswered questions found in this state of the art study of JST programs:

1. Improving Content: Most of the JST programs examined were handicapped with a relatively meager body of knowledge about their essential subject matter--how people can best conduct a productive search for work. Programs need to present participants with a more validated, more appropriate and relevant core of advice which has applicability to a variety of settings, industries, and occupations. To a limited degree, a body of such information does exist in the research findings about labor market operations and job search, and within the literature and training materials of the employment service. However, this body of information remains largely unknown and unused by JST practitioners and curriculum developers. At a minimum, two relatively simple national steps would help to alleviate this problem:

   a. A synthesis could be prepared incorporating the existing research findings about how people look for work, together with instructional materials, which could serve as a staff training syllabus, a reference document for JST leaders, and which could be disseminated among JST service deliverers.

   b. The development of high quality film modules would be especially useful in programs where staff training is inadequate or unavailable. The films would insure the delivery of consistent, accurate information to the job seeking public.

2. Program Administration: The JST movement has been hampered by duplication of effort, underutilization, absence of criteria for staff selection and training, and inadequately developed national standards for measuring costs and outcomes. Several administrative actions would be useful:

   a. Centralized community JST resource centers could improve the quality of services, increase utilization, and reduce costs. Such a centralized JST resource center would require the ability to cut across the isolation of different delivery systems and combine various target groups.

   b. The quality of leadership in JST programs needs to be improved. Minimum standards for selecting leaders could be developed to insure a minimum quality of service. Entry specifications for new employees in employment institutions should be reexamined to insure that they incorporate these skills, training, and experiences particularly suited for group leadership so that JST leaders could be selected from a larger pool. Training, staff development, and supervision all require considerably more attention than heretofore given in order to fulfill the potentials of the program.

c. A standard method for allocating costs and arriving at JST outcome measurements need to be explored which considers relevant factors including who and what will be counted, at what point and by what method follow-up will be conducted, and what will be considered success that will permit uniform evaluations of JST programs, in any delivery system.

4. Research Needs: Though the agenda for research is not a priority item in the current climate, JST programs would benefit from two types of research effort:

a. More evaluations of JST effectiveness are needed. The current state of the art provides inadequate direction to policy makers on many issues of cost effectiveness. Experimental designs with non-treated control groups are needed that would compare JST to both traditional agency services and to those who receive no services of any kind. Studies that compare different JST models on grossly varied dimensions such as the cost effectiveness of a four-week program compared to a one-week program would provide important guidelines to policy makers and program operators.

b. Labor market research is needed which probes and analyzes the hiring processes involved in different hiring environments. The state of the knowledge is currently inadequate to provide job seekers with solid, validated information about how best to conduct their search for work, and to provide JST programs with better guidance on curriculum emphases. As a consequence, the field is permeated with mythology, and over-dominated by a singular image of the white-collar, professional job-finding process. Very little research has been conducted about these processes in other occupations, and in specific industries.

5. Disseminating Information: Despite the proliferation of private sector activity in job search and the spread of knowledge about the subject through books and other commercial literature, government sponsored programs have suffered from inadequate dissemination of two types of information:

a. Users of employment and training programs--job seekers, employers, educational systems, other government and community agencies--have been inadequately informed of the existence of this service component and its potential value. To attain full utilization of JST programs and provide the community with a responsive service, a conscious effort must be made to disseminate information which would induce greater use of and support for such programs. As the widespread continuing availability of a free, individual brokering service becomes increasingly doubtful, the public perception and its traditional expectations of government programs must be altered.

b. Within the employment system, there is a great need for a central source of materials and information about JST programs, and a means for exchanging information across the nation. JST now operates as a set of discrete, disconnected local activities with designers and operators forced to pull a program together from loose strands of scattered material. Programs are operated in isolation, with little opportunity to exchange knowledge and experiences. A national clearinghouse function would be a great aid to local programs, especially during this period of evolving models and content.

In short, JST has emerged from a long period of relative obscurity to become an important new service component. ORC's state of the art study, as documented in this report, displays a service which is inherently valid and widely valuable. Yet, it is a service that needs further development to achieve its potential. A supporting infrastructure of policies and administrative actions is needed, some of which have been outlined in this report. An investment in building this infrastructure would seem to be worthwhile because there are skills and knowledge about finding work which can be imparted successfully, to everyone's benefit.

APPENDIX

Method and Scope

State of the art research, a term usually associated with technology, suggests that the research goal is to identify and describe the most advanced development--the cutting edge. In pursuing this project, ORC staff found that such a characterization was not entirely applicable because the field itself has not been identified, the universe was unknown, and the criteria for the "cutting edge" or most advanced had yet to emerge. The goals of this study were to describe the basic phenomenon itself, to probe its logic, to characterize the diversity of models, and to identify directions of change, for the edification of policy makers and program operators. Such a study is by its very nature descriptive and judgmental, but every reasonable attempt has been made to confine judgments within a rigorous analytical framework.

ORC Approach

All research takes a basic approach toward its task. ORC staff approached this project with the perception that it must be fundamentally qualitative, exploratory research. This presumes that relatively little is known about the subject at the beginning and that the specific research strategies and methods must emerge and be developed in the process of gaining the necessary understanding. Thus, the research design and instruments developed in advance of field work would have to be tentative. The exploratory approach requires flexibility to adapt as the integrative and iterative processes of thinking, data gathering, and analysis move forward.

In contrast, the evaluative approach builds a statistically based, analytical model, with variations in performance as the dependent variable. This is an appropriate approach when the study goal is to advise policy makers about which of several models is "best" or most effective. A key premise is that the phenomenon has reached a state of development where the major design alternatives are relatively stable, the major period of innovation and development is over, and the major policy concern is resource allocation.

The JST component did not fulfill the key premise for an evaluative design. JSTs were proliferating rapidly, even as the research was in progress. Basic models are still undergoing change, and new, home-grown varieties are still emerging. The movement is clearly in a process of rapid innovation and development. The primary need, in ORC staffs' view, was to assist and further that process rather than to deflect it with a premature evaluation. Other factors that influenced that decision were:

- The assumption that quantitative knowledge gained in such an unstable period is subject to becoming rapidly outdated.
- A number of respected actors and observers in the field had explicitly urged ORC against trying to identify a "best" model at this stage.
- Comparable outcomes or cost data would be a prerequisite for evaluative research. Obtaining such data across the lines of three different delivery systems, with different record-keeping and cost-accounting methods, was infeasible, even if all of the ORC resources were used to pursue that inquiry.

The selection of sites for study and observation reflected the ORC approach. A state of the art study does not ask for the average or norm. Rather, the criterion for selection of field visit sites was that each program represent the development of some important dimension in program design or context. Hence, the sample selected was entirely purposive and is not necessarily representative of typical patterns of program operations. Indeed, in many cases, the search was for the rare event or the needle-in-the-haystack.

Methodology

The research process involved essentially five stages: (1) identification of the programs, (2) selection of study sites, (3) development of field instruments, (4) data gathering, and (5) data analysis.

Data were gathered through telephone interviews, on-site interviews, on-site observations, interviews with significant individuals, attendance at seminars, review of program documents, and review of literature.

Identification of Programs. The first concern was to locate JST programs. The national Youth Office was asked to provide information about nationally funded youth sites, and WIN national leaders identified important WIN sites. All Department of Labor regional offices were contacted and asked for known and/or examplary JST projects in WIN, ES, and CETA. Regional offices were also asked to survey CETA prime sponsors, requesting them to identify JST programs operating under their jurisdictions. The regions varied in their response to the request. Eventually, 405 of the 1979 total of 456 CETA prime sponsors were surveyed. A number of ES state offices were interviewed by telephone to identify known and/or exemplary ES and WIN JST sites. In total, over 300 sites were identified where JSTs existed which, on first cut, appeared to fall within the definition. Program materials were also forwarded to ORC.

Through an examination of program descriptions and telephone interviews, the list was reduced to 62 sites for potential visit and further study. The telephone calls also served to establish critical modeling characteristics that would aid in the selection process. In a few cases, the definitional boundaries were somewhat stretched because some intriguing activity lay just beyond the border and seemed to demand inclusion.

Site Selection. A number of considerations determined the choice of 30 sites for visits. Th first task was to identify and select youth JST programs. This was required by project contract in preparing for the ORC Youth Demonstration. The second task was to select CETA, WIN, and ES programs. Beyond that, ORC staff considered a number of primary and secondary modeling dimensions in making selections. The 30 sites were chosen with the following primary considerations: youth programs--six sites; nationally recognized models, originals and replications--six; exemplary programs recommended--six; location--rural, inner-city, out-of-California ES--four; unique curriculum emphasis--three; unique institutional arrangements--two; unique service deliverer--one; size of program--one; time variation--one. Beyond that, at the secondary level of selection, some programs were picked because they had other interesting features: mixed youth/adult participants, PSE participants, programs inspired by unique individual concepts, geographic distribution, buoyant and slack economies.

Field Visit Guide--Modeling Dimensions. ORC observers developed an initial guide for conducting the field visits that explored various aspects of a JST program. Each cycle of data gathering resulted in changes in the basic framework to reflect new insights. The final form is expressed in the organization of this report, further modified by the changed institutional realities. The framework or guide itself was highly detailed, with numerous specific questions. Its design was intended to organize the massive amount of data and to overcome impressionistic aspects of the observations--or at least to separate them from objective data gathering. The outline was structured to permit horizontal analysis of various dimensions across the 30 case studies under the major headings.

Data Analysis. The 30 case studies, the program materials, and the additional 32 sites with telephone interviews were analyzed both vertically, as separate cases, and horizontally, by each dimension of the field guide. Matrices were constructed to capture all of the critical issues in order to provide a basis for controlled analysis of an otherwise unstructured body of data.

Caveats. The methodology illustrates both the strengths and weaknesses of the study:

- A complete census of JST programs was not conducted. The rapid expansion of JSTs would have outdated the data by the time this report was published. Yet it is believed that significant models were surfaced.
- Outcome and cost data were offered by some program sponsors. However, ORC staff found on initial probe, that success criteria and cost factors were so varied and inconsistent that comparability was impossible, and potentially misleading data would be offered. Hence there is no basis for choosing a best program or best model. In fact, given the rate of proliferation and experimentation, the "best" may be just developing.
- The study would not be able to establish which factors within programs account for greater or lesser effectiveness; all programs were nominated for their exploratory nature.

A JST program is a complex intervention which is many faceted, and it may be administered in a variety of settings. ORC resource limitations made it unfeasible to gather and analyze data on all of the modeling dimensions from every vantage point. ORC observers were confronted with one of two choices: apply an equal level of depth and effort to every phase of a JST program, which would produce a relatively shallow descriptive overview, or as an alternative, select certain aspects for more probing and deeper analysis, which would produce a report of unequal analytic depth. ORC observers chose the latter course for the following reasons.

- Very excellent and valuable documents are already in the field which provide overviews of the JST phenomena, and which have been widely circulated. At the overview level, ORC staff would have little more to contribute.*
- Each of the three delivery systems involved with JST has institutional constraints and problems that, in and of themselves, would require great probing and deep study in order to make a significant contribution to the field.
- The one thing shared by all JST programs is that people come together, a leader stands before them and offers information and training about how they should go about looking for work. Thus, the opportunity to observe 30 programs in operation representing diverse delivery systems and client groups, provided a unique case study data base on which to draw for concentrated analysis of the conduct of JST programs.

ORC staff determined that the most valuable contribution they could make was to focus the data gathering and analytical energies on what takes place within the workshops themselves--the kernel. No such effort had been undertaken by any other observer and, because of the history of involvement in direct service delivery by some of its principles, ORC was uniquely suited for that task. Hence, this report reflects that choice. It concentrates on the activity itself, especially on the content of what is being taught. Administrative and institutional matters were addressed only in so far as necessary to give perspective and context.

---

*Robert Wegmann, a consultant to ORC on this project, wrote a paper, "Job Search Assistance: A Review" which was a critical factor in increasing national awareness of JST. Bart Kennedy prepared a paper for the Private Industry Council Staff, "Self-Directed Job Search: An Introduction" which is now being circulated. Both are excellent and comprehensive. Both are available through: Inquiries Unit, Office of Management Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room 10225, 601 D Street, Washington, D.C. 20213.

Date Base--Scope

This section describes the basis upon which institutional identity was ascribed to the visited sites, and identifies the external environments. Matrix tables appear at the end of this chapter (Table 1) listing the individual sites and their geographic and institutional characteristics. The tables are offered to indicate the diversity of settings in the data base.

Institutional Matrix. The most benign way to characterize what a researcher encounters when attempting to unravel the employment and training delivery system now is utter confusion and bewilderment. Funds, staff, and service deliverers cross over from one delivery system to another at every level and are different in different communities. Even the seemingly simple task of assigning a program to one of the three basic delivery systems--CETA, WIN, ES--involved complexity.

To make such assignment, three elements were considered:

1. Who has program responsibility? This might include a host of elements; who keeps records, who initiated the program, in whose offices is it administered, who is answerable?
2. Who funds the program? Even that element was often muddy, as programs exercised heroic ingenuity to link funds from a variety of sources, to join titles, to combine state and federal funds.
3. Who actually delivers the service? Again, the elements were confusing and inconsistent. For example, ES staff may deliver the service as a subcontractor to a CETA program. In one state, state funds are administered through the ES for JST, but the delivery is subcontracted to private contractors. What should be the institutional identity?

Since the main thrust of this research is to examine the JST itself rather than how institutions operate, ORC staff chose not to be unduly diverted, and to make decisions on the best available evidence, with some application of logic. For example, two programs--one a welfare reform site, and the other a general assistance program for welfare clients with some CETA funding--are arbitrarily assigned to the WIN/Welfare category because all the clients are on welfare. A CETA-funded youth program is initiated by ES, operates with ES staff within an ES office. Nevertheless, its participants must be CETA eligible and do receive stipends. It is designated as an ES program because it is most influenced by that institution.

Withal, the institutional distribution of the visited sites is:

CETA	12, of which 4 are youth programs
ES	11, of which 2 are youth programs
WIN/Welfare	7

Most programs intermingle youth and adults and many programs which are not designated WIN/Welfare do include welfare and WIN recipients among their participants.

In both ES and WIN, the service is always delivered by the staff of the institutions though this is shared with staff of the local social welfare agency in two programs. In CETA, JST is delivered by a variety of different types of subcontractors.

All of the WIN JST programs developed as a result of state or national impetus; the process was top-down. Most of the ES sites were in California where the impetus has been the policy decision of the state agency. However, in four ES sites outside of California, the impetus was from the local office staff. The CETA sites all evolved from local initiative.

Geographic Matrix. The 30 visited sites were found in 27 different locations in 13 states. More of the programs studied were in the western part of the nation than elsewhere. This is a consequence of the fact that JST programs originated in the west, are more numerous there, and California is the only state where the program operates statewide in the ES. California offered ORC a variety of alternative ES designs. However, DOL regional offices IX and X (the far west) were far more aware of the existence of JST programs. In fact, regional offices in Regions III, IV, and VI reported almost no programs. As a consequence, 13 of the visited sites were in California, 17 of 30 in Regions IX and X.

The 30 programs were located in 27 communities of widely different size and racial composition:

Population of Program Locales

0 to 9,999	3
10,000 to 49,999	7
50,000 to 99,999	5
100,000 to 249,999	4
250,000 to 499,999	2
500,000 and up	6
	27 program locales

Only New York and Los Angeles exceeded one million, though San Francisco, St. Louis, and Milwaukee were each central cities with high minority density. Though blacks were the predominant minority in most places, there were a few sites where Hispanics constituted the main minority group. In the 27 communities, 13 served large rural populations though the community itself might be fairly sizeable.

Minority Composition of Places

Minorities of 25% or more	9
Minorities 10 to 25%	9
Minorities 5 to 10%	2
Minorities 0 to 5%	7
	27

Labor Markets. The programs visited were functioning in areas that ranged from high to low unemployment rates, as of June, 1980. Of the 27 locations, San Mateo had the lowest unemployment rate--3.9 percent--and Modesto had the highest--13.7 percent. Unemployment rates ranged between 6 and 10 percent in 22 of the sites.

Only four of the visited programs were in communities where manufacturing constituted over 30 percent of the industrial activity: Camden, Milwaukee, Rockingham, and Lansing. At six of the sites plant layoffs and closings were reported. On the other hand, seven sites reported buoyancy and growth in the economy. Four of the sites were college towns, and two were state capitals. Overall, the diversity of the visited sites would indicate that JST is not a phenomenon whose relevance is limited by type of community or labor market.

JST Models in Relation to External Conditions

ORC staff were unable to find any consistent relationship between external factors such as economic conditions, community size, or population characteristics, and the choices made by program leaders about what to teach or how to teach it. For example, one small rural area considers the use of the telephone as a tool inappropriate for small communities. Another, of approximately the same size, insists on use of the telephone. Discussions with program operators indicate that in many cases the choices are based upon what the decisonmaker heard, observed, obtained from national directives, or bought commercially, without examining the appropriateness of the approach to the local environment, and without any evidence that modifications were made to fit that situation. In most cases, the decisionmakers did not know there were options among which to choose.

GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS CETA VISITED JST SITES

PROGRAM	SITE POPULATION 1975	MAJOR POPULATION SERVED	UNEMPLOYMENT RATES/JUNE 1980	MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION	DELIVERY STAFF	FUNDING SOURCES/ PARTICIPANT PAYMENTS	Participants	PLACE IN PROCESS
1. ARCATA OPTIONS Humbolt Co. Calif. IX	12,087	Rural	11.8	College town, tourism, lumber	Private non-profit contractor (CBO)	Mixed titles, no stipend	Mixed CETA eligibles	Intended up front; including PSE; JST not pre-requisite
2. CAMBRIDGE JOB FACTORY Mass. I	102,420	Suburban	6.2	Polaroid layoffs, college town, technical manufacturing	Central CETA staff	National Youth Office Demonstration; stipends	Youth, out of school	Free standing; JST not pre-requisite
3. CAMDEN ACTION FOR CAREER EDUCATION New Jersey II	9,066	Suburban	11.8	Two major firms shut down; manufacturing over 30 percent	Central CETA staff	Mixed titles; stipends	Mixed CETA eligibles	Mainly up front; JST pre-requisite for other CETA
4. LANSING JOB CLUB Michigan V	126,805	Rural	9.6	Heavy auto layoffs	Social service agency	YETP/Title IV; No stipends, expenses	Youth	JST not required; voluntary
5. MODESTO HEAD REST Stanislaus Co. Calif. IX	83,540	Rural	13.7 high	Fast growth area; capitol turkey, food processing	CBO	Title IV; work experience; full stipends	Youth	JST not required; voluntary
6. HILLSBORO MULTNOMAH/ WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM Oregon X	25,000	Suburban Rural	5.9	Light manufacturing, farming; near Portland	Central CETA staff	All CETA titles; mixed CETA, welfare clients; stipends	Mixed heterogeneous groups; including youth	JST occasionally pre-requisite; mixed

GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS CETA VISITED JST SITES

PROGRAM	SITE POPULATION 1975	MAJOR POPULATION SERVED	UNEMPLOYMENT RATES/JUNE 1980	MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION	DELIVERY STAFF	FUNDING SOURCES/ PARTICIPANT PAYMENTS	Participants	PLACE IN PROCESS
7. PALACIOS TRANSITIONAL PRE-EMPLOYMENT Texas VI	6,959	Rural	4.7	Dow chemical plant; only itinerant program	School district	YETP Title IV stipends ½ time	Youth dropouts; 16 to 21	JST occasionally pre-requisite; mixed
8. SCARAMENTO URBAN MANAGEMENT CORP. Calif. IX	260,822	Urban	7.9	State capitol; growth in technology industry	Private contractor profit	Title IID & VI; PSE expense money	PSE mandatory	Two months before end of PSE
9. SAN DIEGO SELF-DIRECTED PLACEMENT CORP Calif. IX	773,996	Urban	7.5		Private contractor profit	Title IIB; stipends	CETA eligibles	Mixed and free standing; JST not pre-requisite
10. SAN FRANCISCO INTENSIVE JOB SEARCH, MOET Calif. IX	664,520	Urban central city	6.8	Heavily unionized; tourism, corp. hdqts. low manufacturing	Central CETA staff	Title IID & VI, PSE, no expense money	PSE non-mandatory	Mainly in one month before PSE ends
11. SAN MATEO JOB SEARCH WORKSHOPS CORP. Calif. IX	77,878	Suburban	3.9 lowest	Close to Silicon Valley, unions strong, within SF commute	Private contractor profit	IIB, IID, IV PSE, youth cycles; stipends	CETA eligible, and special target groups	JST not required
12. TUCSON JOB FINDERS WORKSHOPS, PRE-JOB TRAINING Arizona IX	296,457	Urban	6.6	Sunbelt, very active, low wages, few unions	ES staff, CETA unit Hoffman trained	Title IIB Stipends	Heterogeneous, CETA eligibles, walk ins.	Free standing, JST not pre-requisite

GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS   STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE   VISITED JST SITES

PROGRAM	SITE POPULATION 1975	MAJOR POPULATION SERVED	UNEMPLOYMENT RATES/JUNE 1980	MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION	DELIVERY STAFF	FUNDING SOURCES/ PARTICIPANT PAYMENTS	Participants	PLACE IN PROCESS
1. BERKELEY FIELD OFFICE Calif. IX	110,465	Urban Suburban	8.3	College town	ES, placement unit	No funds No stipends	Flow of traffic, mainly professionals & career choice	Flow N/A
2. FRESNO FIELD OFFICE JOB FINDERS Calif. IX	176,528	Rural Urban	8.4	Center of wine growing; heavy agriculture; long range depressed area. Recent industrial growth	ES, temp. & intermittent	State Youth Funds; IIB, IV; Discret.; stipends	CETA eligible out of school youth	Free standing
3. GALESBURG FIELD OFFICE Illinois V	34,981	Rural	7.1	Electric & electronic equipment manufacturing	ES	CETA discretionary; no stipend	CETA eligible; out of school youth	Free standing
4. LOS ANGELES SOUTH GATE FIELD OFFICE Calif. IX	7,000,000	Urban city center	7.8	Integral part of LA metro; heavy plant layoffs in district	ES	No funds No stipends	New UI claimants; laid off auto workers	Beginning of UI
5. PORTERVILLE FIELD OFFICE Calif. IX	14,748	Rural	7.2	Grapes, cotton, industrial base; low wages, non union	ES temp. & intermittent	No funds	ES flow and UI	Flow of traffic
6. RAPID CITY FIELD OFFICE/JOB EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM South Dakota VIII	48,156	Rural	4.6	Right-to-work, lowest wage rates. Heavy tourism	ES temp. Part time	No funds No stipends	WIN, CETA clients flow of traffic combined	Flow of traffic CETA and WIN

GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE VISITED JST SITES

PROGRAM	SITE POPULATION 1975	MAJOR POPULATION SERVED	UNEMPLOYMENT RATES/JUNE 1980	MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION	DELIVERY STAFF	FUNDING SOURCES/ PARTICIPANT PAYMENTS	Participants	PLACE IN PROCESS
7. ROCKINGHAM FIELD OFFICE North Carolina IV	6,316	Rural	8.9	Fast growing, textile and mill products. Labor force 25,000 (in county service area)	ES, counselor	CETA discret. Stipends	Flow of traffic, voluntary; CETA eligible, mixed	50% to work site assessment
8. ST. LOUIS FIELD OFFICE Missouri VII	523,964	Urban city center	9.2	Heavy recent General Motors layoffs. Highest percentage of minorities	ES, counselor	No funding No stipends	Counselor's referrals	After counseling session
9. SAN DIEGO SERVICE CENTER Calif. IX	REPORTED #9 CETA				ES, placement unit	No funding No stipends	Job ready flow UI claimants	Newly registered mostly
10. SAN FRANCISCO FIELD OFFICE Calif. IX	REPORTED #10 CETA				ES	No funding No stipends	Professional & career choice, all local offices	N/A
11. SANTA CRUZ FIELD OFFICE Calif. IX	36,807	Rural	7.5	Highly seasonal, tourist, college town	ES, professional staff	No funding No stipends	Traffic flow, UI	N/A

GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS WIN/WELFARE VISITED JST SITES

PROGRAM	POPULATION 1975	MAJOR POPULATION SERVED	UNEMPLOYMENT RATES 1980	MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION	DELIVERY STAFF	MANDATORY/ VOLUNTARY	MODELING ISSUES	INCENTIVES OVER WELFARE
1. HARLEM JOB CLUB New York II	8,000,000	Urban city center	7.3	Mainly black ghetto	ES/WIN	Mixed	Original Azrin test site	$30/month $3/lunch transportation
2. HAYWARD JOB CLUB Calif. IX	92,802	Urban	6.5	Big blue collar work force; within commute of San Francisco & San Jose	SAU staff ES/WIN	Voluntary attendance pre-WIN certification	Hoffman trained JASAP-CALIF. experiment/comb. WIN/CETA/ES	CETA stipend until welfare certification
3. LOWELL WELFARE REFORM SITE Mass. I	94,493	Urban	7.0	Cold textile, big growth & economic renewal effort	WIN/ES	JST pre-requisite	Straight Azrin	Incentive and expenses ↑
4. MILWAUKEE* Wisconsin V	665,796	Urban city center	6.7	Biggest program, heavy manufacturing	Social service agency	Mandatory	Azrin	½ CETA stipend
5. SALEM JOB CLUB Oregon X	78,168	Rural	9.5	State capitol, big layoffs	ES/WIN SAU staff	Mixed	Modified Azrin	$40/week - 2½ weeks $3.50 lunch and transportation
6. SIKESTON JOB CLUB Missouri VII	15,775	Rural	9.4		ES/WIN counselors	Mandatory	Straight Azrin	$15/week $2.00 lunch and transportation
7. TUCSON Arizona IX	REPORTED #12				WIN/ES	Mixed	Hoffman trained leaders	$35 weekly incentive

*Not WIN--General Assistance--CETA funds for ½ time stipend

Bibliography

Azrin, N.H., et al. The Job Finding Club As A Method for Obtaining Employment for Welfare-Eligible Clients: Demonstration, Evaluation, and Counselor Training. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, July 1978.

Azrin, Nathan H. and Besalel, Victoria A. Job Club Counselor's Manual. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1980, p. 10.

Birch, David L. The Job Generation Process. M.I.T. Program on Neighborhood and Regional Change, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1979.

Bolles, Richard. What Color Is Your Parachute? Berkeley, California: Ten Speed Press, 1981.

Galassi, John P. and Galassi, Merna Dee. "Preparing Individuals for Job Interviews: Suggestions from More than 60 Years of Research." Personnel and Guidance Journal, December 1978.

Hahn, Andrew and Barry Friedman. The Effectiveness of Two Job Search Assistance Programs for Disadvantaged Youth. Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University, 1981.

Jackson, Tom. Guerrilla Tactics in The Job Market. New York: Bantam Books, 1978.

Jackson, Tom and Davidoyne Mayleas. The Hidden Job Market: A System to Beat The System. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Co., 1976.

Johnson, Miriam. The Public Employment Service and Help Wanted Ads: A Bifocal View of the Labor Market. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Jordan-Laurenti and Associates, Inc. An Assessment of WIN Job Club Programs Within the State of Texas and Selected Projects Within Region VI. Jordan-Laurenti and Associates, Inc., January 15, 1981.

Mangum, Stephen L. Job Search: A Review of the Literature. Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Centers, 1981.

Sontag, Susan. Illness As A Metaphor. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1978.

Walsh, John, Johnson, Miriam, and Sugarman, Marged. Help Wanted: Case Studies of Classified Ads. Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Co., 1975.